THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXII MARCH, 1936 No. 189

EDITORIAL

With a new King begins inevitably a new era. "The old men who stood before his father" are not dismissed, nor is their counsel rejected. In fact our constitution is such that those whose judgment really determines the course of national affairs go on unchanged. But all the older men feel themselves older than they were. A younger generation is knocking at the door, and the seniors, in both Church and State, know that the end of their period of service has drawn appreciably nearer. The fact that they are now serving under a young King makes them feel their age. The life of His Majesty King Edward VIII. has hitherto been that of a young man, a young man of capacity and judgment, but with the eagerness and love of adventure that belong to youth. We all hope that the cares of State will stabilize this, but not solemnize it overmuch. Just as it is said that the perfect man will always have something of the woman in him, and the perfect woman something of the man, so the ideal in another way is to combine the virtues of youth and age. "They that wait upon the Lord," says the prophet, "shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; they shall walk and not faint." These things are often assumed to be alternatives, and so very often they are. They represent the law of compensation. "God fulfils Himself in many ways." But it is also possible to have the gift which joins the active flight of young energy with the measured gait of wise experience. So may it be in the new Reign.

We had the usual shock when an Order in Council prescribed the new wording of the Prayers for the Royal Family. It was not in this instance particularly grievous. After all, the King in Council may be expected to dictate how the Royal

House should be publicly described, whether in Church or out of it. But it does call attention to an old problem. Can we reach a true *modus vivendi* for the Church as it now is and the State as it now is? It is of no use simply to repeat the language of Hooker, or even Burke or Thomas Arnold. What of today? And there is today an event of outstanding importance. The Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Church and State (Vol. I, *Report and Appendices*, 2s. 6d., Vol. II, *Evidence of Witnesses*, 7s. 6d. Press and Publications Board, Church House) has just been published, and is being studied with eager interest. It would be a thousand pities if the opening years of King Edward VIII. were marred by a clash of Church and State. The Report does not suggest that a clash is very likely. Its starting-point is the famous affirmation of Archbishop Davidson in the Church Assembly that:

> It is a fundamental principle that the Church, that is the Bishops, together with the Clergy and the Laity, must in the last resort, when its mind has been fully ascertained, retain its inalienable right, in loyalty to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to formulate its faith in Him, and to arrange the expression of that Holy Faith in its forms of worship.

The Commission has not found among those who gave evidence any serious difference of opinion on the truth of this principle.

Sir Thomas Inskip does "not disagree in principle." Mr. Albert Mitchell, who submits long and careful memoranda on behalf of the National Church League, goes nearer to criticizing it. He does not in terms deny it, but he is so convinced that the Revised Prayer Book was an attempt by the Bishops to alter the doctrinal position of the Church of England that he does not relish the prospect of giving to the Church, which, as he cannot help observing, is to a considerable extent guided and influenced by its Bishops, any real measure of freedom. He regards Parliament as having in 1927 and 1928 saved the Church from itself, and it is evident that he wishes for Parliamentary control to be maintained in matters "spiritual" and otherwise. The Modern Churchmen's Union agree with Archbishop Davidson's pronouncement, but they urge that "the process of knowing its own mind is a prolonged one." They believe that they can discern "a movement back to standards of conduct based on belief in God and acceptance of the sanction derived from them," and they are disposed to trust that more than any immediate action.

The hope of the Commission is that in the first place, through the method of the Round Table Conference or otherwise, determined efforts should be made to secure agreement on the subject of the permissible deviations from the 1662 Order of Holy Communion and on the use and limits of Reservation. Substantial progress having been made in this direction, they hope that new powers will be secured for the Church to deal for itself with matters that are agreed to be of a spiritual nature. Simultaneously with this they are looking for a reformed system of Church Courts. Their actual suggestion here is new. It is that the Archbishops shall prepare a panel of Judges and other persons, clerical or lay, who are specially qualified. and that the Crown should nominate the Court from among these. In the meantime, Bishops should have power not to institute clerks who have not satisfied the Bishop of their willingness to obey the law, and, in order to make this reasonably possible, it is suggested that the Convocations should make a Synodical Declaration on that subject. This would have the effect of helping to roll away the grave scandal that clerical affirmations, being ineffective, are to that extent insincere.

We believe that the prospect of securing agreement is better than is often supposed. One Round Table Conference is not enough. There ought to be a great many, in all parts of the country, and they ought not to be too large. Some years ago a large Conference was held on Eucharistic doctrine in London. It was too large to reach more than a sort of agreement to differ. The suggestion was that there were two schools of thought (or if a more adult word be desired, signifying a more inveterate habit of mind, two colleges of thought), A and B. The A people should not condemn or revile the B doctrine, and *vice versa*. A few of the members of the Conference thought that more could be done than this. Accordingly they met several times and drew up a document. Their personnel was very varied, and their members were very faithful in reporting "Those who are behind us would not accept this or that. Something else must be found." Accordingly, in such cases something else was found, and in the end there appeared a dozen or so propositions which all signed. They were published, with some comments, as *Eucharistic Doctrine* (S.P.C.K., 1s.). It is possible that some might enter the now proposed conferences determined to seek party advantage, and with minds hermetically sealed beforehand. But we are persuaded that most Churchmen would enter with the hope that they would themselves be led

into some larger truth than they knew or possessed before, and willing to make their contribution, to be fused with that of others, in some common augmentation.

The fact that charges can be made against clerical veracity is serious: *mala fides* should be imputed as sparingly as possible. There are some who have a preconceived idea of the Reformation and its blessings and view the seventeenth-century Prayer Book and the twentieth-century Church of England through sixteenth-century spectacles. Others, at the other end, have developed the view that the promise to "use the form in the said Book prescribed, and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority" was made under State duress and what they really promised was to do something else of a more "Catholic" nature. Both these methods seem to us very gravely unsatisfactory, but we suppose that they are conscientiously adopted, and we accordingly hope not that those who practise them will be punished or driven out, but that the ground will presently be taken from under their feet. Meantime, a large number of others have been pushed by force of circumstances into an indefensible position. There is no malice in it, and no *mala fides*, and nothing contrary to the *ethos* of the Prayer Book. But their situation needs to be reformed. The Editor of this Journal once published in the Parish Magazine of which he was at that time the editor a classified list of the numerous breaches of the law which were committed in the Parish Church. The number was about forty. A few were due to what may be called scientific reasons, one (failure to catechize after the Second Lesson on Holy Days) to pastoral inefficiency, and the vast majority were due to consideration for the worshippers and reluctance to change the order to which they had become accustomed. All the irregularities, except one, were subsequently covered by the Revised Prayer Book. This was the situation in very many parishes. It was not ethically wicked; indeed it was in many respects very desirable. But it was illegal. Add a large number of parishes in which an even larger number of illegalities were regularly committed through ignorance, and it is evident that the situation needed mending.

It is not necessary here to recapitulate the events which caused the Revised Prayer Book to be left with a very large measure of solemnly declared Church authority, but an authority which it was possible from two points of view, the Parliamentary and the Canonical, to criticize. Suffice it to say that we believe

that behind the two topics proposed for consideration at the Round Table Conferences a larger question lies. That question is: Do you or do you not believe in the Church of England as a living part of Christ's Holy Church? There are some who seem to believe in Parliament, and some who seem to believe in the Pope, and there are some who seem to believe that we are getting on very well and there is no need to bother. But many of those who do believe in the Church of England are of opinion that the situation is very critical, and may in a short time be desperate. The Church of England may in a short time lose the confidence of many of its best friends. The method proposed by the Report is an attempt to save us from this catastrophe. If it fails (and Archbishop Davidson's phrase "in the last resort" is rather terribly elastic), we shall be driven to what the Bishop of Durham and other serious and important voices are demanding already.

A contributor to the February number suggested that the devotional output of Church publishers was not very important. We are reminded that the recent publications of Messrs. Mowbray include: *The Spiritual Exercises of Saint Ignatius, Ignatian Retreats, Retreats for Priests:* According to the Method of St. Ignatius, *Priesthood and Prayer* (Bede Frost), *Prayer in Modern Life* (Francis Underhill), *The Mind's Ascent to God* (translated from the Latin of Cardinal Bellarmin), *Meditations for Every Day* (Father Andrew, S.D.C.), *Spiritual Letters of Father Benson, Spiritual Letters of Father Congreve.* These make a goodly list.

It ought to be explained that the anonymity of the writer of the original Note on St. Matthew xix. 3-12, whose rejoinder is published in this number, was accidental.

CHRISTIAN POLITICS

I.—The Problem

The Italo-Abyssinian conflict and the elections have brought home to many people that Christianity cannot be indifferent with regard to social and international problems. But will the Christian contribution to political life consist in Christian Politics, as is widely held today? This I rather doubt. By Christian Politics I understand the belief that God's revelation to Christianity contains principles which can, and therefore must, be applied directly to the political order, and which have to be brought into practice by specifically political measures, above all by legislation.

In this connection I do not argue whether and to what extent political measures, such as disarmament, control of private arms manufacture, sanctions, reorganization of social and economic life on a collective basis, etc., are advisable or can be helpful in a certain situation. They have a right of existence, if only they are dealt with as matters of expediency, belonging merely to the political order. But my point is this: When such measures are taught to be the genuine and necessary outcome of our Christian belief, when we are told that it is our Christian duty to support them, and when concern for Christian Politics is deemed to be our principal task, then we are faced with the same problem as St. Paul was when he wrote his epistle to the Galatians—viz., Is Christian life and faith in the first place moral activity? I hold that the idea of Christian Politics is based upon a wrong understanding of the Gospel, and that we shall therefore fail again and again and for ever, as long as we try to Christianize the world by means of a moral law.

The truth of this argument does not depend on the nature of the measures which are suggested. I think Christians are equally mistaken when regarding Socialism or Fascism or Pacifism or any other political "-ism" as something specifically Christian. There is, for example, no essential difference between those who condemn war as incompatible with the sixth commandment, and those who try to justify it as the divinely appointed means of re-establishing justice in a world where conditions are continuously changing. For in both cases man is anxious to establish historical righteousness through moral activity.

II.—The Error of Religious Moralism

In the idea of Christian Politics two elements have been linked which have no natural connection: on the one hand a belief in the Kingdom of God, and on the other hand the belief that moral activity can alter the nature of man and society. Eschatological hope is a genuine element of the Gospel and essential to our belief. But in the idea of Christian Politics this eschatological factor is misunderstood, and the responsibility issuing from it is therefore given an inadequate and unsatisfactory expression. This is the reason why every attempt to bring Christian Politics into practice is bound to be a failure both politically and religiously: (1) politically, because it aims at ends which are God's alone; and (2) religiously, because it assumes an attitude which is in contrast with the will of God.

(1) In the idea of Christian Politics spiritual and earthly goods are placed on the same level, and the fundamental difference is overlooked which exists between the natural and the supernatural. In our activities we are naturally inclined to consider this world as an end in itself. This is most obvious in political life. Because the State is confined to the resources of the earth, its principal aim must be self-preservation. Hence derives, of necessity, the utilitarian character of political activities. Political measures and political organizations are meant to serve the good of the State, and the best statesman is he who is able to gain from a political situation the greatest profit for his country. We must not blame him for so doing. It is in the nature of his work that he should follow this line of action.

But hence arises the difficulty for a Christian statesman. In theory the programmes of modern Christian politicians seem to offer something fundamentally new, and this is, I think, the reason why so many people have become so enthusiastic about the idea of a new world order on a Christian basis. But because of the utilitarian character of political activity the Christian statesman has to adjust in practice his programme to the necessities of the State and to the resources available at the moment. On the other hand, it is a matter of experience that as far as considerable changes have been brought about in politics, they depended on the vitality, courage and energy of the acting statesmen rather than on their Christian convictions. This is the reason why, in the political activity of Christian rulers and statesmen, there is nothing to be found of the unheard-of newness which characterizes the Kingdom of God.

(2) To this statement certain keen champions of Christian Politics will reply: "You cannot expect, of course, an absolutely new order to be brought about, as long as you subordinate the idea of Christian Politics to the so-called necessities of political life. Christian Politics presuppose radicalism and courage to experiment"; and they go on and say: "Personally we do not care whether our country would collapse when Christian Politics were introduced. We stand for the new order of the Kingdom of God, and God's will has to be carried out, however unpleasant and unsatisfactory may be the immediate result"! These politicians believe, in fact, that it is in man's power (or at least in that of a Christian) to bring about such a permanent and veritable social order as is supposed to exist in the Kingdom of God.

This belief is a misinterpretation both of history and of man's power in it, and its result must necessarily be fatal. First of all, these politicians will be compelled by the events to counteract their own aims. For as soon as the citizens discover that this kind of radical policy does not further the existence and the well-being of their community, they will rebel against these Christian leaders. These in turn must have recourse to coercion. Because they believe their programme is the purest expression of God's will, they cannot tolerate any other conception of politics but theirs. But they overlook the fact that the root of all social and political evils lies in man's heart. As long as there is no love of justice, no sincere charity and no spirit of sacrifice in every man's heart, no real change can happen in the political sphere. In the present state of things, no League of Nations, no universal disarmament, no New Deal, no Classless Society, nor any other economic reform, can do away with national rivalry, war and social unrest. On the other hand, coercion never changes a single heart. The terrible experience which the U.S.A. have had with Prohibition is striking, and should be a warning against any new experiment with Christian Politics. Prohibition was believed to be a genuine application of Christian morals to civic life, but its result has been moral anarchy, which now endangers to a considerable extent the very existence of political order in the U.S.A.

Moreover, coercion used as an instrument of Christian Politics would render this policy contrary to Christ's message. That Christians want to impose their Christian convictions upon their fellow-citizens by means of a majority vote or even by the use of force is, in my opinion, a very serious point. For it would mean that Christian brothers are denied the right of their conscience. The Church can and must tolerate the

rich variety of opinions on political and social subjects which her members conscientiously hold, as long as unity in the essentials is maintained. It is therefore incompatible with our belief in the work of Christ that acceptance of certain conceptions of Christian Politics should be enforced by legislation. To use economic pressure or military force for this purpose would be even worse. In the propagation of Christian convictions the only method allowed is persuasion. In the case of dissensions within the Church we must appeal to our brother's belief in Christ and shew him how the inferences he draws from it are mistaken.

The belief in Christian Politics is the modern form of the belief in righteousness by works, and shews the same fatal symptoms of this attitude as had been denounced by Jesus Himself and by St. Paul. There is an inherent tendency in such attempts as Christian Politics to regard God as lawgiver only, and eventually the belief in the living God is replaced by that in an abstract moral law. It is therefore not amazing that the programme of Christian politicians can so easily be accepted by Rationalists, Jews and heathen. On the other hand, the nature of history and Christian eschatology is misunderstood when man substitutes for the experience of the presence of God obedience to a divine law. Man thinks he is free to choose the means and methods which will further the advance of God's Kingdom, and he overlooks the fact that God is the Lord of history, and that man has to adapt his work in history to the opportunities which God offers him.

Furthermore, the freely accepted domination of the moral law has an unexpected effect upon man's life. Under the stubborn sway of the moral law life can no longer be lived freely, and the individual loses his royal right to serve God according to his special gifts and the degree of his insight. Life becomes impersonal and has to be adjusted to an objective norm. It is not by chance that Christian Politics tend towards uniformity, and modern dictatorships are but secularized forms of this Christian moralism in politics. Moreover, the "bondage to the law," as St. Paul calls it, becomes manifest in the negative outlook which the law enforces upon man. He is not naturally good, and because under the pressure of his moral experiences he is brought to recognize this fact, the supremacy of the moral law compels him to be mainly concerned with his sins and transgressions. He is no longer able to enjoy life and to regard his actions from a constructive point of view. They all become means of preventing trespasses. Thus legislation increases prolifically in order to keep people on their right way.

Thus we can say in conclusion: Christian Politics will prove

in every case to be a failure, not only politically but also, and above all, religiously. Hence they are incompatible with the true conception of Christian faith.

III.—The Way of Faith

Does this result mean that Christians have to be indifferent towards political and social problems? Certainly not. For such attitude would be based upon a misunderstanding of the Gospel. Christian faith is far from being Fatalism. The Gospel expressly stresses our responsibility for the world. Because of our eschatological expectation of eternal peace and true justice, we cannot avoid hoping for a complete change in this world and for an entirely new order both in social and international relations. But we have to make a new start. The way of religious moralism and of Christian Politics is mistaken, because it is anthropocentric. The moralist asks: What have I to do? The Christian question, on the contrary, acknowledges the supremacy of God and asks: Where and how can I find Thee, O Lord? Then God replies: In and through My word spoken in the Church.

Those who aim at Christian Politics miss the realism of God's activity, which manifests itself in a particular history. They start from the idea of a divine law, which, as a rule, they identify with the Bible. But although it is true that the Bible contains God's word, such an attitude overlooks God's living nature and takes the dead historical document of His revelation for the call He makes to us. God's revelation cannot be separated from the history which it has called, and still calls forth. As God has worked out the sacred history of Israel under the Old Covenant, so He is present under the New Covenant, both in the work which the risen Lord performs in His Church and in the activity which the Holy Ghost displays in the hearts of the believers. Under these circumstances the New Testament, and through it the Old as well, are but pointers to the reality of the living God. Doing the will of God means, therefore, seeking after the living God, and the only way of finding Him is by listening to the "Viva vox Evangelii" in the Church and by making a personal response to this call with the help of the Holy Ghost. It is not difficult to shew how those who regard the Bible in itself as an absolute authority are led to substitute their own ideas to the will of God.

In history the Church of Christ is both the agent of God's will and its perpetual commentary. Hence there can be no true faith without membership in the Church, and there can

be no satisfactory Christian contribution to removing the social and political difficulties other than through the medium of the Church, for she is the spiritual centre of the world. As Christ's body on earth, she repeats His words through her sacraments and her teaching, and represents them through the devotional life in, and the social spirit of, the congregation. The fact that there exists a Church with liturgical and sacramental life and with sermons reminds mankind that this world is not an end in itself, and that there is to be sought a reality beyond this earthly one. We can say, without exaggeration, that to such an extent is the Church the centre of Society that the few hours of worship on Sunday count more for the progress of mankind than all the busy work of the six other days of the week. This importance of the Church is not lessened by the shortcomings and deficiencies of our denominations and congregations. For in a dark room even the poorest candle is of greater moment than the most pompous furniture. The mere fact that religious service is held recalls to mankind the truth of Christ's saying: Without Me, ye can do nothing.

Such high estimation of the Church involves the dangers of Clericalism and external Ritualism. But they would certainly not be the response which God is waiting for. Although He speaks to us through institutions, His word is meant to be a personal call to each member of the Church. Then only may we be sure that we have listened to it in the right way and have understood it well, when we are able to respond to it in a personal manner. This is done mainly in three ways: through unconditional acceptance of every event in our life as a word of God, through brotherly love, and through personal prayer.

IV.—The Church and the World

This Christian attitude looks like fleeing away from the needs of this world. But, in fact, this personal faith is related in the directest way to the difficulties of mankind. For the faith of the Christians is the instrument through which Christ transforms Society. It yields to man the only possible freedom in this world. Naturally he is enslaved by the solidity of the facts, which seem to compel him to adjust himself to "the real world," or by the absolute obligations of the moral law which, as has been shewn above, make him unable to live a personal life. In Christian faith we have seen through these delusions. Our new outlook is therefore exactly the contribution which mankind is longing for. Although it affects to despise and to disdain the believers, in fact it looks to them; for what matters above all in our social perplexities is the

existence of men and women who know true life from experience, and who understand that the main source of trouble is the belief in, and therefore the dependence on, this world. In the last resort, social and political anarchy are based on the fear that our fellow-men are prepared to harm us and our well-being, and that this threat can be checked by force only. The only remedy to this false opinion is the example of people who in their lives shew that wonderful independence of, and superiority over, the world, which characterizes the children of God. They witness to the world that life can be lived without fear and in happiness.

Since God speaks His word through the Church, the most adequate expression of our personal response will be given in the life of the congregation. Its zeal in devotional life and its social spirit are the factors which call forth the change in Society which we all are so anxious to see. The Church is the community of believers, who all together form the body of Christ. His Kingdom is not purely transcendent. He transforms Society through the fact that under the influence of God's word His followers form a social body with entirely new opportunities and tendencies to live together. Here, and here alone in the world, exists real brotherhood. We know what tender plant this brotherly love still is. But there it is; and only in the Church do we find the possibilities for, and the conditions of, its development. Within the congregation personal antagonism and resentment can never grow so great that they could not be overcome by faith. For each one can appeal to his brother's experience of the love which Christ has shewn for him. The fact that the possibility of true love exists in the Church matters infinitely much for the social order of the world, because it makes Christians capable of contributing effectively to the solution of the present difficulties.

It is our great privilege to have the power of building up an absolutely new type of social life within the frame of the Church. We ought to be ashamed that comparatively little has been done in this respect. It is no use working for a new social order in general, as long as the spirit of Christ does not yet determine all the relations which we have with the other members of our congregation. I do not underrate at all the amount of help mankind can receive from the activity of social and political organizations, nor do I disparage social legislation. But we may be sure that all these measures will have lasting and wholesome effects only if they are executed in the spirit of Christ. We have seen that within the political order it is impossible to apply, without compromise, Christian principles to the problems of daily life. But within the

Church it is possible, under all circumstances and at all times. There lie our chance and our responsibility.

The problems of this world will be solved only in proportion to our taking the Church seriously and enabling it to be a true Church of Christ. The example of the Church shews where true life is to be found and what are its principles. Social progress in the Western world has in every case been initiated by the Church. The work of her brotherhoods, of her monks and nuns, and of her deacons and deaconesses, have been the origin of social welfare organizations and of social legislation. On the other hand, when the social spirit in the Church was weakened, the social groups outside the Church wasted away, because they lacked an effective check to their inherent anti-social tendencies. How can this world believe that Christian principles can work in social and political life, as long as the Church herself does not apply them to the life of the congregation? How can the world believe in true justice, as long as in our congregations and in our private relations with our Christian brothers we still cling to the deadly conception of legal justice, which is the source of perpetual conflicts? How can the world believe in peace, as long as Christians strive against each other and as long as Church life is a battlefield, full of ambition, hatred, and suspicion, rather than a flourishing garden of peace? Finally, how can mutual understanding between nations, social classes, and human races be believed to be the final end of history, when the denominations shew indifference towards, or contempt and suspicion of each other? The progress of the world depends on the Church. The more Christians grow in faith, and the more they are anxious to make of their denominations and congregations the Church of Christ, the more will they serve the world.

We do not condemn or despise the zeal and the enthusiasm displayed for the good of mankind in today's endeavours towards Christian Politics. For this sense of responsibility and this effort are urgently needed. But we hold that the emphasis has to be shifted from activities, which have their centre outside the Church and Christian life, to the Church itself. When we accept her spiritual gifts, recognize her fundamental importance for the rebirth of Society, and make efforts to transform the congregation into a body of loving brothers and sisters, then and then alone shall we promote progress in social and political life. For from that moment the Church will be not only the light of the world but also the leaven, which leavens and transforms the whole lump of Society.

OTTO PIPER.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ROMAN RITE DURING THE DARK AGES

I

THE purpose of this paper is to clear up several obscure points in connection with the development of the Roman rite from the fifth to the ninth centuries. The paper falls naturally into five sections, of which the first attempts to demonstrate that the so-called Gelasian Sacramentary and the Gregorian Sacramentary represent two separate and distinct traditions, only accidentally fused in the Leonine Sacramentary, which stands outside the direct line of liturgical development. Accordingly the books which will be referred to in this section are the following:

L, the so-called *Sacramentarium Leonianum*, a collection of mass prayers, surviving in a single MS. of the seventh century at Verona.* The prayers are ill-arranged, as many as twenty-eight masses being given for a single festival, while sometimes the titles, which should keep the masses of one day distinct from those of the next, have been omitted or wrongly inserted. The book is damaged, and so defective, containing no Canon, no masses for Lent, and only half the *Sanctorale*, but it is by no means certain that the first two items mentioned were in the undamaged copy. The best edition is by C. L. Feltoe.†

V, the Vatican MS. Reg. 316, commonly referred to as the *Gelasianum* and published by H. A. Wilson under that name.‡ This is the only complete MS. of this type of sacramentary, but a few other extant fragments serve to shew that this MS. is not *sui generis*, but is one of a definite family or group of sacramentaries. **V** was written in France and dates from about the year 700. As it stands **V** is a Gallicanized book, but the Gallican additions are easily removed, and **Ur-V** then remains as a perfect example of a book of the Roman rite, which must have entered France and started to displace the Gallican rite there

* Bishop Frere has stated (*Studies in Early Roman Liturgy*, Alcuin Club, 1930, vol. i., p. 30) that this collection (L) must date from the middle of the sixth century, and for the purposes of this paper this date is accepted. It may be argued, however, that though much of the content of L is of undisputably early date, the collection itself is no older than the MS. we possess. I am disposed to think that the later date may prove to be the correct one, as it is not easy to see why L should have been worth recopying after sixty or seventy years, but I wish to point out that the later date would, if anything, strengthen the case I have to present, and where the date is disputable, I have preferred to assume the earlier as in itself giving me no help, and being still generally accepted.

† Cambridge University Press, 1896. ‡ Oxford University Press, 1894.

by before the beginning of the seventh century.* It may be accepted that no changes were made in the actual prayers of the masses in **Ur-V**, but that they stand in **V** just as they entered France (subject to the minor textual errors of copyists), so that the removal of Gallican additions leaves us **Ur-V** as it was used in Italy or Rome.

G, the true *Gregorianum*. In about the year 600 Pope St. Gregory the Great revised the Roman service-books, and **G** was the book he thus produced. No copy of **G** has survived, but there can be no doubt that **H** substantially represents **G** in content. Certainly **H** contains some few whole masses more or less, but it is accepted that the content of masses common to **G** and **H** remains unchanged. Therefore **G** may be in large part reconstructed by removing from **H** any masses known to have been added after the time of Pope Gregory I., and for the purpose of section 1 of this paper this is all that is necessary, so that the results obtained may be checked in any edition of **H** if the reader removes for himself the irrelevant matter in that book. The further differences between **G** and **H** are discussed in section 3.

H, the *Hadrianum*, the Roman sacramentary (purporting to be identical with **G**) sent by Pope Hadrian to Charlemagne at the very end of the eighth century. It was printed by Wilson as the "Gregorian Sacramentary."†

Section 1.

It was suggested by Mgr. Duchesne‡ that **Ur-V** was the original Roman sacramentary, which continued in use at Rome down to the eighth century and later, while **G** was only instituted by Gregory as the Pope's book; and Edmund Bishop§ recognized **Ur-V** as being in truth the mass book of Pope St. Gelasius, though he conclusively disproved Duchesne's theory as to **G's** comparative unimportance and **V's** long-continued supremacy, and suggested rather that **Ur-V** was, at the beginning of the seventh century, re-edited by St. Gregory and replaced at Rome by his new book (**G**). More recently Bishop Frere,‖ while rejecting the claims to authorship of St. Gelasius, accepts **Ur-V** as indeed an early Roman book, though Italianized as well as

* This is a very conservative date indeed. Bishop (*Liturgica Historica*, Oxford, 1918, pp. 57 *sq.*) puts forward a very strong case for supposing that Ur-V made its way to France as early as the middle of the sixth century, and we may certainly fix the original composition of the book at some time during the last quarter of the fifth century, or, at latest, the first quarter of the sixth.

† Henry Bradshaw Society, 1915, pp. 1-143.

‡ *Origines de Culte Chrétien*, Paris, 1909, pp. 122 *sq.* At least, I take it that Ur-V is the other book which he suggests existed along with the Pope's book.

§ *Op. cit.*, pp. 45-61.

‖ *Op. cit.*, pp. 42 *sq.*

Gallicanized to become the *Gelasianum* as we have it (*i.e.*, **V**), and apparently he does not disagree with Bishop's view that **Ur-V** was the book which Gregory revised into **G**. Yet when we consider the strength of Frere's case for the Italianization of **Ur-V**, we may wonder whether his suggestions are radical enough, and whether they do not point not to Italianization of a Roman book, but rather to an Italian origin of the book.

It is certain that where **L** and **H** are in agreement they shew the true Roman use of the sixth century, and probably earlier. From this agreement, Frere points out, **Ur-V** differs in several important respects. First as regards the calendar, the following feasts which represent the use of the city of Rome are omitted by **Ur-V**: the *Septem Fratres*, a festival which dates back to the time when the calendar shewed the shrine at which the official mass would be said rather than the mass every priest was to say in his own church: Pope St. Stephen, obviously Roman: SS. Felicissimus and Agapitus, buried in the famous cemetery *Prætextati*: SS. Felix and Adauctus, buried on the *Via Ostiensis*: and St. Chrysogonus, the titular saint of one of the urban basilicas. On the other hand, seventeen festivals are added in **V**. Of these two, Invention of Holy Cross and Decollation of St. John Baptist, are Gallican, presumably added in France,* but the rest suggest a *provenance* in central or south Italy, some half-dozen being of saints from Cumæ or Capua, and most of the others concerned with the region round Rome, suburban rather than Roman of the city. A second characteristic of **V** is that all purely urban features of the Roman rite, the Lenten stations, the mass of St. Anastasia at Christmas, the Greater Litany of April 25, the processions at Easter vespers, the Pope's almsgiving on the Saturday before Palm Sunday, the collectæ at churches other than the stational church, all these are omitted and leave no trace. In the third place the arrangement of **V**, which keeps the *Temporale* and the *Sanctorale* distinct, and adds a third book of occasional masses, is quite different from that of **G** and **L**, which give the masses of saints and seasons arranged chronologically in a single book: and also the **V** masses have two collects, while those of **L** and **G** have only one.

Thus far Frere. Now from the evidence of the books later adopted abroad from Rome, we know that such Romanisms were not regarded as detracting from the value of a book and so to be omitted, but quite the reverse, and, at an earlier date as well, the third canon† of the Council of Vaison (529) and the

* Though Frere suggests that these two were also added in Italy, owing to the influence of the Greek-speaking South.

† Et quia tam in sede apostolica quam etiam per totas Orientales atque Italiæ provincias dulcis et nimium salutaris consuetudo est intromissa ut *Kyrie eleison* frequentius cum grandi affectu et compunctione dicatur, placuit etiam nobis, etc.

fourth* of the Council of Braga (563) apparently regard Roman origin as a recommendation. So it is unlikely that if **Ur-V** ever incorporated these Roman features they would have been removed, and accordingly these divergencies from the Roman tradition in three such important respects at any rate suggest that **Ur-V** was never in use in the city of Rome. That a similar book was compiled in Italy in the sixth century we know. Agnellus† tells us that Maximian of Ravenna *edidit missales per totum circulum anni et sanctorum omnium. Cotidianis et quadragesimalibus temporibus, vel quidquid ad ecclesiæ ritum pertinet, omnia ibi sine dubio invenietis.* So there can be no *a priori* objection to the view that **V** was put together in central Italy, where the overshadowing prestige of the capital city had led not only to the use of the Roman rather than the Gallican rite from the beginning,‡ but also to the following of the Roman calendar, supplemented to meet the needs of local piety, but adopted wherever its commemorations were felt to be of general interest.

A careful examination of the mass prayers which, naturally, constitute the principal content of **L, V** and **G**, not only supports this conclusion, but in the opinion of the writer puts it almost beyond doubt, and would by itself be sufficiently conclusive without all the evidence already discussed. It is instructive to find, for example, that of the 135 Lenten prayers in **G**§ only twenty-five are found in **V** for Lent, while of these only four are given for the same day in both books. The impression made by this discovery is heightened by the evidence of the *Sanctorale*, where for all the days common to the calendars of **V** and **G** throughout the year not ten prayers are to be found common to both books.

Contrast the position of **L**. Of **G** Lenten prayers only 14 are found in **L** it is true, but **L** contains 54 **V** prayers for this season. Again, in the very small section of the *Sanctorale* common to all three books, 45 of the prayers in **V** are also in **L**, which contains 37 **G** prayers as well.

Now if we are to believe with Bishop and Frere that **Ur-V** was the Roman mass-book of the sixth century, it becomes quite impossible to understand what can have been the policy

* Item placuit ut eodem ordine missæ celebrentur ab omnibus quem Profuturus quondam huius metropolitanæ ecclesiæ episcopus ab ipsa apostolicæ sedis auctoritate suscepit.

† Cit. ap. Bishop, *op. cit.*, p. 59 note.

‡ *Cf.* the famous letter of Innocent to Decentius, which shews the opposition which met any attempt at introducing the Gallican rite within the sphere under the direct influence of Rome.

§ The prayers for from Ash Wednesday to Quadragesima and those for Thursdays in Lent are not included in this reckoning as they were not in G as first published by St. Gregory, and those for the last three days of Holy Week are also omitted.

of Pope St. Gregory. Apparently his "revision" consisted in a scrupulous rejection of every prayer that was in traditional use in the Roman Church (two or three dozen escaped his vigilance admittedly), and in the substitution of a book 86 of whose Lenten prayers alone (to say nothing of almost the whole *Sanctorale*) had not previously been published, while 14 more were to be found only in the wilderness of **L**. Such a policy seems, to say the least, unlikely in conservative Rome, and is in strong contrast to the later work of Gregory II.*

If the true state of affairs be as we have already suggested, however—viz., that **V** was an Italian book *ab initio*, these difficulties disappear. If **V** was formed from a group of prayers circulating in Central Italy, while St. Gregory in his revision of the earlier Roman book (of which we have no knowledge) was careful to use only Roman prayers, it is natural that the two books thus produced have little in common, though it need occasion no surprise that a few prayers are found to be common to both.

In any case this close examination of content makes it finally impossible that **L**, or any book even remotely approximating to **L** and consisting of a mixture of **V** and **G** prayers, should be accepted as representing any stage whatever of liturgical development: for then we would have to believe that **V** and **G** represent different selections of prayers from this central tradition. In this case the great Pope's reforming activities would become even more improbably perverse than Bishop found his traditional operations on the Canon; for, by impossible accident or inexplicable intention, in making his selection he would have succeeded in picking from this mass of material just those prayers which a century before had been passed over by the compilers of **Ur-V**, whoever they were. The fusion of the two traditions (Italian **V** and Roman **G**) in **L** must be an accident. Apparently the book is an attempt by a somewhat careless and unskilled priest to adopt for his own liturgical use, according to the city of Rome's calendar and customs, prayers which he found in use in the neighbouring churches and dioceses, which prayers he added to a core of the prayers of the city use. **L** is *sui generis*, and apart from its ordinal and what there is of its calendar, it can be of little importance for the history of the liturgy.†

It may be asked how, if all this is true, **V** comes to bear the

* *Vide infra*, section 4.

† Note also that if, as is suggested above, **L** was not compiled in this manner until the seventh century, there is no longer anything to connect the **V** prayers with Rome. It is perhaps the fact that so many of these **V** prayers are found in what is apparently the oldest Roman book (**L**) that has led to the acceptance without question of **V** as a Roman sacramentary.

title *Liber Sacramentorum Romanæ Ecclesiæ*, and the name of Pope St. Gelasius. To the first question it may sufficiently be answered that though of Italian *provenance* **V** is still very clearly a book of the Roman rite, and so in great contrast to the Gallican books which were in use elsewhere in Europe, and which it displaced in France, and that in questions of order the book still in fact shews unmistakably the origin of its use. In addition to the prayers which today form part of the Missal, **V** incorporates several *ordines** of Baptism, Ordination, Penitence and so on, and these, as would be expected in the case of these important matters of exact ceremonial and ritual, were like the Canon and Ordinary of the Mass, sought direct from Rome. By chance they have preserved some traces of their origin. The best example (quoted by Frere, *op. cit.*) is the title of the *ordo* of Ordination:

ORDO QUALITER IN ROMANA SEDIS APOSTOLICAÆ ECCLESIA
PRESBYTERI DIACONI VEL SUBDIACONI ELIGENDI SUNT

Mensi primi quarti septimi et decimi Sabbatorum die in xii lectiones ad S. Petrum, ubi, etc.

The second question, as to the name *Gelasianum*, will be discussed *infra*, section 5, after a further examination of the history of these books through the three centuries of their development.

II

The second section of this paper deals with the date of **G's** first introduction into Gaul, and the third attempts to discover if **G** contained any masses for Sundays throughout the year, and to solve the problem of why the Monte Cassino palimpsest contains these masses while **H** does not. The fourth section is concerned with the additions to the sacramentary made by order of Pope Gregory II. In section 5 an attempt is made to sum up the history of the books, and incidentally to suggest how the name *Gelasianum* came to be attached to a type of sacramentary.

In addition to the *Leonianum* (**L**), the *Gelasianum* (**V**), the Gregorianum (**G**) and the *Hadrianum* (**H**), reference is made in these sections to the following books:

MC, the Monte Cassino palimpsest, written between 675 and 725 and described in detail by Dom Wilmart,† was a sacramen-

* The rubric for Holy Saturday, *Post hoc surgens sacerdos a sede sua dicit orationes de vigilia Paschæ, sicut in Sacramentorum* (sc. *libro*) *continetur*, shews clearly that these *ordines* were originally separate books only incorporated in Ur-V after, or when, it was made up. Thus they have no bearing on the subject previously discussed, the source of the mass prayers.

† *Revue Bénédictine* for 1909, pp. 281 *sqq*.

tary in use at Rome itself, and it may well be a typical copy of the later recension of **G** which I shall call *G. sec. vii.*—*i.e.*, the *Gregorianum* as it was in use at Rome during the seventh century.

S and **P**, the sacramentaries of St. Gall and Padua respectively. These are typical eighth-century recensions of a book made up during that century by the fusion of **V** and **G**. Many other recensions exist, as everywhere the fusion was carried out independently, but no good purpose would be served in this paper by quoting other examples. Edmund Bishop referred to this type of sacramentary as *Gelas. sec. viii.*, which is misleading, as the books are actually of the Gregorian type, following its arrangement and scrupulously retaining its Romanisms, but not hesitating to substitute the familiar prayers of **V** for those in **G**. The whole recension is better called *Gelasio-Gregorianum sec. viii.*, and will be referred to in this paper as *VG. sec. viii.*

ALC S, the supplement added to **H** by Alcuin at Charlemagne's request. **H** did not contain enough masses to meet the needs of worship which had been fostered in France by the use of the very full *VG. sec. viii.* In any case, apart from the lack of votive masses, **H** did not contain masses for the Sundays after Easter and Pentecost, so had to be enlarged to some extent. Alcuin did not compose new masses, but added this supplement from the books already in use. **ALC S** was published by Wilson in the *Gregorian Sacramentary*.*

Section 2.

If we are to be enabled to obtain evidence of any respects in which **G** may have differed from **H**, it will be necessary to find out something of the Roman sacramentaries which were in use between the reigns of Popes Gregory and Hadrian. Apart from the evidence of **MC**, we can only learn indirectly of these intermediate Roman books through the books *VG. sec. viii.*, which, as we have already said, are a fusion of **V** and **G** carried out in France. We have already suggested that **Ur-V** entered France during the sixth century, and if we can discover at what date **G** followed it, we shall know better what value may be placed on the evidence as to **G** afforded by the books *VG. sec. viii.*

To fix the extreme limits between which **G** must have entered France we may note for the early limit that St. Gregory composed **G** in about the year 600, so that it will hardly have left Rome before that date; while we know that Martinien and Boniface carried with them the Roman book on their missionary

* *Op. cit.*, pp. 145-232.

journeys in the early eighth century: and a later limit of about the same date is given by the introduction by Pope Gregory II. of masses for Thursdays in Lent* between 720 and 730. But an examination of the *Sanctorale* of the *VG. sec. viii.* books will enable us to fix much narrower limits. As, for instance, the mass in the *VG. sec. viii.* books for May 12, *Dedicatio Ecclesiæ* B. *Mariæ ad Martyres*, is identical with the mass in **H** for that festival, it follows that the copies of **G**, from which *VG. sec. viii.* was compiled, did not leave Rome until after the festival was instituted. The church in question, the old Roman Pantheon, was dedicated by Boniface IV. in 609.† Evidence of other festivals examined on the same principle gives a slightly later date, for the copies of **G** which found their way to France also contained the feast of the Purification of our Lady and that of the dedication of the Basilica of St. Nicomedis (c. 620), and finally the *VG. sec. viii.* books mention on Easter Sunday the Collect at the Church of St. Andrew *ad Lateranis*, which gives as the early limit for their compilation the reign of Honorius (625-638).

This date is confirmed by a comparison with **V**, which shews that it was not until some time after 628 that *VG. sec. viii.* was put together; for the **V** mass for the Exaltation of Holy Cross (added to the calendar after the recovery of the true Cross by the Emperor Heraclius in that year) had time to get so well established in Gaul that the compilers of *VG. sec. viii.* gave it the preference, only adding a collect from the mass in **G**.

Similarly it can be shewn that **G** left Rome before the institution of the feasts of Pope St. Gregory, of St. Sabina, of the Annunciation and of the Assumption, which last-named festival was in the calendar by the time of Pope Sergius (687-704).

We may therefore fix the limits of 640-690 for the arrival of **G** in France.‡

Section 3.

As **G** is the earliest Roman sacramentary of which we have any certain knowledge (if the rather different *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus be excepted) it is worth taking pains to discover,

* While during the rest of Lent 80 of the Lenten prayers in **S** are given for the same day in **H**, and 17 more for other days in **H**, for Thurdays in Lent there is no agreement whatever between **S** and **H**. Clearly then the copy of **G** from which **S** was compiled left Rome before the addition of masses for these Thursdays, and they were added independently in France and Rome: *vide* section 4 *infra*.

† For the dates given in this section *vide* Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis*, *passim*.

‡ Minor differences between the various books of *VG. sec. viii.*—some, for instance, do and some do not contain the feast of the Nativity of our Lady—still leave these dates unaltered. They shew that, as we might expect, copies of **G** crossed the Alps at different times between the limits fixed.

if possible, the exact contents of this book. We know that **G** did not contain any masses for Thursdays in Lent, or for the days between Ash Wednesday and Quadragesima, and obviously enough the masses for festivals which were added to the calendar during the seventh and eighth centuries cannot have been in **G**; but did **G** also differ from **H** in containing some masses which **H** did not? To be more explicit, were the masses for Sundays after Christmas, Epiphany, Easter and Pentecost, whose omission from **H** has been a matter for doubt and despair to many, to be found in the original *Gregorianum*? Similarly, did **G** contain any provision for daily and occasional masses?

Evidence to help us to answer this question comes, as we have seen, from two sources. Of unique importance is **MC**, which gives us fragments of a book (naturally Gregorian) in use at Rome itself at the end of the seventh century. Of importance secondary to **MC** alone are the books of the recension *VG. sec. viii.*: as I have shewn above, the Roman books upon which this recension is based had entered France at about the middle of the seventh century, and so provide earlier evidence than **MC** of the recension *G. sec. vii.*

To take this latter evidence first, note that **P** chooses a **G** prayer in preference to the **V** prayer selected by **S** ninety-six times from the beginning of the book to the end of June, but only five times does **P** substitute the same **V** prayer as **S** in place of a **G** prayer. This is enough to shew that, as from their geographical position we should expect, the two books **P** and **S** were produced quite independently of one another, and only by rare chance agree in incorporating the same **V** matter into **G**; though it is quite clear that they are both revisions of **G**, in which **V** prayers are added to or substituted for **G** prayers in a greater or less degree.

Now for the Sundays throughout the year **P** and **S** have the same masses, and these masses are almost entirely of **V**, not of **G**, material. Yet the arrangement of these masses in **V** is so inadequate, and has been so radically revised in **P** and **S**, that neither can we believe that **P** and **S** copied **V** directly, nor, in view of their close agreement with each other, can we believe that they revised **V** independently. Presumably then, the revision had already been carried out in the other source shared by **P** and **S**—viz., *G. sec. vii.*

The evidence of **MC** may now be taken, and proves this surmise to be certainty, for **MC**, the only extant Roman MS. of the seventh century, contains these **V** masses rearranged into the same order as that in which they are found in **P** and **S**. Incidentally this also shews that **MC** is not *sui generis*, but may be accepted as typical of the whole recension *G. sec. vii.*

We have now seen that the Sunday masses* were included in **G** by the middle of the seventh century, but we have yet to decide whether or not they were placed there by St. Gregory himself. To answer this question we must scrutinize the content of these masses more closely, and it may clear the air if a few examples analysing the relations between the various recensions are given.

The **V** mass for the Sunday after Ascension Day is reproduced in **S, P** and **ALC S** for the third Sunday after Pentecost. **S** gives both **V** collects, **P** the second of the collects only, and **ALC S** the first only.

The sixteenth **V** Sunday mass is given in **S, P, MC** and **ALC S** for the twenty-fourth Sunday after Pentecost. **S** gives both the **V** collects, **P** gives the second only, **MC** and **ALC S** give the first only. Furthermore **S, P, MC** and **ALC S** are agreed in substituting a Post-communion different from that in **V**.

The mass given in **S, P, MC** and **ALC S** for the twenty-fifth Sunday after Pentecost is not found in **V**. Of the two collects given by **S, P** and **MC** give the first only, while **ALC S** has only the second.

These three masses are typical. The substitution by **P, S, MC** and **ALC S** of one non-**V** prayer in a **V** mass is not uncommon (occurring in 10 out of the 19 Sunday masses from **V**), and renders it indisputable that other documents stand between these recensions and **V**. We have seen that these other documents must be *G. sec. vii.* Now the fact that of the two collects given in **S** sometimes the one and sometimes the other is chosen by **P, MC** and **ALC S,** and that rarely is there unanimity in their choice, **MC** in one case agreeing with **P,** in another with **ALC S,** can only lead to the conclusion that our intermediate documents (*G. sec. vii.*) themselves contained two collects per mass. So that whoever it was who copied these **V** masses into *G. sec. vii.*, he was at no pains to make them conform with the **G** type of one-collect mass.

We may well wonder whether this person can have been St. Gregory himself. We have already seen how few **V** prayers occur in his work, and that the **V** type of two-collect mass is never found. Is it likely that St. Gregory would have adopted so different a method for Sundays, even though we accept the hazardous suggestion that the first collect would have been adapted for use *ad collectam*, the second for the stational mass ?†

* I have examined and analysed with equal care the daily and occasional masses, and those given for the Commons of Saints, in **V, ALC S, P, S** and **MC,** but their interrelations are too confused to yield any clear answer to our questions, except that the *missæ quotidianæ* were certainly in *G. sec. vii.* before the recension *VG. sec. viii.* was made from it.

† The unsatisfactory nature of this speculation is shewn by the fact that **ALC S** actually retains the two collects for the first of the *missæ quotidianæ*. It will

It seems more probable that these masses were added in the course of the seventh century by other revisers who, like Pope Gregory II. in the next century, did not hesitate to draw from **V**. The case cited *infra* and the masses for Thursday and Friday before Quadragesima* shew that there were other people in the eighth century who did not scruple to add from **V** such matter as was found necessary, and it is more likely that other unknown compilers added the Sunday masses than that Pope Gregory so altered the style of his work.

Two objections will immediately be raised. First that St. Gregory would hardly have overlooked the need for masses on Sundays. Secondly that the case of the mass in **H** for the Saturday before Palm Sunday, which is the same mass as the **V** mass for Tuesday in the fourth week of Lent, proves that St. Gregory did, after all, make use of **V**. Comparison with the books of *VG. sec. viii.*, however, shews that for this day of Lent alone (Thursdays apart: *vide* section 4 *infra*) there is agreement in not one prayer between **S** and **H**, and furthermore that this is not because **S** has elected to follow **V**, as the mass in **S** is made up of miscellaneous prayers.† Further examination reveals that **P** has no mass for this Saturday at all. Clearly then, for whatever reason (possibly the papal almsgiving of this day affected the matter), there was no mass for this day in *G. sec. vii.*, and the mass in **H** is an eighth-century addition; so that we have another example of some later reviser drawing upon **V**.

To those who raise the first objection mentioned, and cannot rid their minds of the preconception that St. Gregory must, in the nature of things, have provided masses for Sundays, we may reply by reminding them that **H** also contained no Sunday masses, and that the arrangement of **H** (as of **MC**) precludes the possibility that these masses were accidentally lost. It is a sound principle of criticism that one explanation must, when possible, be used to account for all phenomena of a similar nature, and here the link between the activities of Gregory and Hadrian may well be the fact that they both were Popes.‡ It seems not impossible, in fact, that Duchesne's guess was right and that Hadrian was foolish enough to send Charlemagne his own book: nor would this be so egregious a

---

hardly be suggested that a prayer *ad collectam* could be required with this mass, and it would be undesirable to offer one explanation for the two collects on Sundays when a different one would have to be found for the two collects here.

* Of the eight prayers in **H** for these two masses five have been taken from **V**. Friday's mass is reproduced in **P**, so presumably was added to **G** in the *seventh* century.

† Three from elsewhere in **V**, two not found elsewhere.

‡ For what it is worth, those who believe that **L** hails from the Vatican will note that **L** also has no provision for Sunday masses.

blunder as Duchesne's theory would have made it, for the lack of provision for Sunday masses would apparently be the only vital difference between the Pope's book and that in use in the city, and such a detail might easily be overlooked by a busy pontiff.

Section 4.

For the sake of completeness, and as a contrast (which we have several times had occasion to note) to the work of St. Gregory the Great, it may be of interest to analyse here the work of Pope Gregory II. on the Missal. Apparently when he decreed masses for Thursdays in Lent, he found that his illustrious namesake had left unused none of the traditional Roman prayers, and rather than compile fresh masses himself, he drew upon the masses of **V** (which itself, of course, contains no Thursday masses). Consequently we find in **H** that the mass for Thursday in the first week of Lent=the **V** mass for Wednesday of that week (as to 2 prayers), and similarly in the second week (4 prayers). In the third week the Thursday station is at SS. Cosmas and Damian, and the mass in **H** is taken from the *Sanctorale* of **V** for the feast of those saints (3 prayers). Thursday of the fourth week in **H**=Tuesday of the same week in **V** (3 prayers), and in the fifth week the Thursday mass in **H** is that of Saturday in the third week in **V** (4 prayers).

In passing we may contrast this again with the method adopted by the compilers of **S** and **P**. When these Thursday masses had to be added to the already complete book, they made them up with **V** and **G** prayers which had been passed over in the compilation of the masses for the other days in Lent. Thus these Thursday masses in **S** contain 23 **V** prayers and 5 from **G**. (The large proportion of **V** prayers is due to the fact that all but 20 of the **G** Lenten prayers had already been included in **S**, whereas there were still 80 **V** prayers to choose from. In **P**, which had followed **G** even more closely than had **S** in the rest of Lent, no **G** prayers are found on Thursdays, but, needless to say, the **V** prayers given by **P** are not those found in H.)

Section 5.

The conclusions we have already reached may be summed up thus: The books of the Roman rite in use in France during the eighth century were compiled towards the end of the seventh century by a fusion of two traditions of prayer. The first of these traditions is found in **V**, a book which was originally composed in Central Italy at some time within the half-century 475-525, and which had subsequently made its way into France

at some time during the sixth century. The second tradition, the true Roman one, is represented by **G**, the book revised by Pope Gregory the Great about the year 600, which followed **V** into France between 640 and 690, though by that time various additions to **G** from **V** had been made in Rome itself, producing the recension *G. sec. vii.*

The fusion of these two books, the recension *VG. sec. viii.*, came into increasing use throughout France, and by the beginning of the ninth century was, as various inventories and other references shew, in use in the whole north and east as well as in parts of the south-west of the Frankish kingdom. As has been already remarked, however, the mixture was by no means everywhere the same, and a condition of liturgical anarchy resulted, which was extremely displeasing to the orderly mind of Charlemagne, who sought to remedy it by imposing the use of one book in all his dominions. It was to facilitate this that he asked and received from Pope Hadrian the famous copy of the Roman sacramentary (**H**). To the Englishman Alcuin of York he entrusted the duty of producing a supplemented book which should be adequate for all liturgical purposes (as **H** was not), and to complete this book Alcuin added to **H**, as we have seen, not from the original **V**, but from *VG. sec. viii.*, or possibly directly from the Roman *G. sec. vii.*

This brings us to the era at which the name *Gelasian* was first applied to a sacramentary. The evidence strongly suggests, however, that the name was then applied to the mixed book (*VG. sec. viii.*) which Alcuin's work displaced, and, if this is so, it is easy to see how the knowledge that one source of this mixed book was an older work than St. Gregory's, perhaps even a truer tradition that this source book dated from the time of St. Gelasius (492-496), may have combined with the statement in the *Liber Pontificalis* that Gelasius composed *Sacramentorum præfationes et orationes* to cause the popular attribution of this book to him. There is no reason to suppose that our *Gelasianum* (**V**) was so called before Cardinal Bona and Tommasi identified it with the book in more than one volume which John the Deacon at the end of the ninth century supposed or knew to have been revised by Pope St. Gregory. Certainly the ascription of this name has not sufficient authority behind it to detract from the probability that the book was of Italian origin.

To complete the history of these books it may be worth adding that after the work of Alcuin the books in use in France (*G. sec. ix., x., etc.*) were quite different in character from the eighth-century book (*VG. sec. viii.*). No longer were **V** prayers

allowed to oust the prayers of **G**: wherever adequate provision existed in **G** (**H**) this was retained in its entirety (*e.g.*, throughout Lent), and the books of *VG. sec. viii.* were only used as supplementary, though the limited contents of even the full *G. sec. vii.* made such supplementary prayers, masses and ceremonies occupy a large proportion of the new compilation—even in Alcuin's edition more than a third—and this proportion of additional matter increased still further* during the next three centuries; but the Gregorian core was still preserved. In this final state the book at last superseded everywhere the older books (*VG. sec. viii.*) and made its way to Rome, where it also superseded the old Roman books (*G. sec. vii.*), and became with the enrichment of the centuries the Missal we use today.

J. S. SINCLAIR.

NEW DOGMAS

AMONG the problems affecting Reunion in Religion an important place belongs to the question of Development. The principle of Development is everywhere an accepted commonplace. But the extent to which it is considered legitimate is a matter on which opinions differ. Is it permissible in the Christian religion that new Dogmas should arise, or should there be no increase in the doctrines originally received ?

This problem has been much discussed of late among theologians of the Orthodox Greek Church, and of the Latin.

Professor Bulgakoff, of the Orthodox Institute of Theology in Paris, contrasting the idea of Development held in the Greek Church with that in Roman Catholicism, says the former is satisfied with an indispensable minimum of dogmas which are of obligation, whereas the latter tends to formulate by its dogmatic decrees the entire doctrinal possessions of the Church.

Professor Bulgakoff, in his book *L'Orthodoxie*, owns that the Orthodox conception of development certainly lacks the precision of the Latin, and may leave the impression of incompleteness. In matters of a secondary nature, where Orthodoxy offers nothing more than theological opinions or pious usages, the Roman Church presents Dogmas ready made, or at least doctrines officially fixed. But the absence of this exactitude and precision is, Bulgakoff holds, inherent in the very nature of the Church, since its depths are inexhaustible. Moreover, exemption from increasing definition is a gain to the

* Additions were also made from abroad—*e.g.*, the Reproaches of Good Friday were adopted from Spain.

Christian spirit of freedom, and consequently a proof of the superiority of Orthodoxy over Catholicism.

The formulas in which a dogma is expressed reflect the style and peculiarities of the age which constructed them. The Christological definitions of the Ecumenical Councils reveal unmistakably the characteristics of the Hellenistic spirit. Recent Western definitions are, on the other hand, marked by the characteristics and peculiarities of Latin thought. The expression is determined by historic conditions. This does not mean that their substance is not the same. The Relativity belongs to the phrases but not to the contents.

There are, in the Orthodox Church, a limited number of dogmatic definitions. For instance, the fundamental Dogma of the Deity of our Lord. The expression of this Dogma is accomplished and perfect for all time.

The Roman Catholic theory of doctrinal development is explained in an essay by Dom Anselm Stolz, which appeared this present year in the Belgian quarterly *Irénikon*. The essay is important for more reasons than one. Partly because it is the work of a learned Benedictine. Partly because it is intended for the Orthodox Greek, and is written to promote agreement on the question whether new Dogmas are legitimate. Partly because it is written in a very conciliatory spirit.

Dom Anselm Stolz has read Bulgakoff's book, and regards him as the most eminent representative of the liberal tendencies of the new Russian School. The Benedictine begins by affirming that, in the strict meaning of the phrase, there can be no new Dogmas in the Church, seeing that Revelation is closed. Yet, at the same time, the faithful by deeper penetration into the Truth revealed may attain to new dogmatic standpoints which were unexplained by earlier ages. But he admits that a certain number of Catholic theologians have confused the issue by maintaining ideas of doubtful Catholicity. The Benedictine is by no means satisfied with the theory of doctrinal development which some exponents of the Vatican Decrees have held. It differs considerably from that which was maintained in former times.

As an instance, Dom Stolz refers to the work of Professor Vacant,* one of the best known nineteenth-century exponents of the subject in France.

Vacant traces the process by which a doctrine becomes a Dogma through three stages. In the first stage a theological problem is raised. The mind perceives that there is a question of doctrine to be considered. In the second stage the doctrine

* Vacant, *Études théologiques sur les Constitutions du Council du Vatican*, 1895, 2 vols.

is examined. It is compared with the data of tradition and of Scripture to ascertain whether it is in conformity or in contradiction therewith. Thirdly comes the final stage, when Authority pronounces the decision.

Vacant adds an illustration which Dom Stolz omits. The development of Dogma is shewn in the gradual belief that the Blessed Virgin Mary herself was Immaculately conceived. Vacant remarks that the Festival of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary was progressively adopted through Christendom, and then imposed upon the Church. Then, after long discussion, Alexander VII., in 1661, declared that the Immaculate Conception was a pious belief, and subjected to severe penalties those who opposed it in any way whatsoever. After that, says Vacant, the conformity of the Dogma with tradition could not, for Catholics, appear doubtful. Then came the final stage, when the matter was defined to be a Dogma of the Catholic Faith.

On this theory of development, as explained by Vacant, Dom Anselm Stolz remarks that it would appear to follow that the progress of a theological doctrine until it acquires the dignity of a Dogma of the faith is the normal course and the natural conclusion of the process. This theory of reflection on an idea, however, Dom Stolz pronounces to be quite irreconcilable with the idea of Dogmatic Definition which was held in the Council of the Vatican itself.

Dom Anselm maintains that Dogma is not ordinarily created unless a heresy has arisen. But he holds that it by no means follows that such definition would not be legitimate apart from such necessity. Yet he points out that the eminent Jesuit theologian Franzelim, consultor to the theological Commission at the Vatican Council, reported to the Council that it was never the aim of Councils to define a doctrine while that doctrine was in tranquil possession. Franzelim's extensive Memorandum* is certainly one of the most important documents on the subject of the opportuneness of dogmatic definitions. How far Orthodox Greek theologians would accept its contents as a whole is another question. But the fragment which Dom Anselm quotes leads him naturally to refer to Newman's famous letter to his Bishop, Ullathorne, especially to the unforgettable sentences: "When we are all at rest and have no doubts . . . suddenly there is thunder in the clear sky, and we are told to prepare for something we know not what, to try our faith we know not how. No impending danger is to be averted, but a great difficulty is to be created. Is this the proper work for an Ecumenical Council? . . . I look with anxiety at the prospect

* *Acta Collectio Lacensis*, vii., 1611.

of having to defend decisions which may not be difficult to my private judgment, but may be most difficult to maintain in the face of historical facts. What have we done to be treated as the faithful never were treated before? When has definition of doctrine *de fide* been a luxury of devotion, and not a stern, painful necessity?"*

Dom Anselm Stolz, in quoting that letter, has reserves to make about its tone and temper, but claims that it does represent a right idea of conciliar definition.

Dom Anselm Stolz then confronts the objection. If the purpose of creating a Dogma of faith is to refute a heresy which was opposing it, why did Bishops of the Vatican Council, to the number of some two hundred, present petitions to Pius IX. in favour of a Definition of the bodily Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, when at that time no heresy in Mariology had arisen? A full account of this petition will be found in a book by Abbot Renaudin, formerly of St. Mauritius Clairvaux, published in 1933.†

Dom Stolz assures his readers that what the Bishops had particularly in view was the dominant materialism of that time which they hoped to oppose by a Dogma concerned with the Resurrection of the Flesh. Thus the glorification of Mary was not their only aim. The Benedictine admits that their hope may have been mistaken, and that they over-estimated the importance of the Assumption of the Virgin as a means of neutralizing unbelief. This certainly seems to attribute a singularly limited outlook to the Bishops who apparently, to the number of some two hundred, united in this petition. Certainly if the Resurrection of our Lord Himself was ineffective in securing faith in the Resurrection of Christians, it might fairly seem self-evident that the desired results would not be attained by a Dogma of the Assumption of His Mother. But the line of defence is instructive.

Another doctrine which is acquiring increasing popularity among a group of Latin theologians is the universal mediation of Mary in the distribution of grace. Dom Anselm Stolz says that a number of petitions have been recently sent, asking the authorities that this doctrine may be dogmatically defined. Reference is given to a work by Bittremieux, Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the University of Louvain, *De Mediatione Universali B.M. Virginis quoad gratias*, 1926. On this treatise, Dom Stolz observes that this subject is not always advocated with the critical knowledge required, and that Professor Bittremieux rests his assertions on fourteen quota-

* Dom Cuthbert Butler, *Life of Bishop Ullathorne*, 1926, ii., 58.
† Renaudin, *Assumption Blessed Virgin Mary, Matris Dei.*

tions from St. Anselm of Canterbury, of which quotations thirteen are not authentic and the fourteenth does not apply.

It appears that misgivings have arisen in the minds of certain Roman Catholic theologians as to the reasonableness of seeking a Dogmatic Definition of the Universal Mediation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, while no Dogmatic Definition of the Universal Mediation of Christ, which ought logically to take precedence, has yet been formulated. They urge, accordingly, that Definition of the Mediation of Mary should be postponed until after the corresponding Christological Definitions have been decreed. Dom Stolz replies that there is no need for such precautions, since the Church does not define the Faith systematically, but according to actual need. If Mariology is in danger, the Church will define, without hesitation and without inquiry, whether the logical presuppositions have been defined already. At the same time he admits that the usual occasion of a Dogmatic Definition is the existence of a heresy. But whether there is a heresy or not, definition is in either case legitimate.

These recent tendencies constrain the Benedictine writer to face the question: "Is it good and desirable that theologians and the faithful should press for the creation of new dogmas of faith? Without prejudging the contents of the definitions so desired, it is permissible to ask this question, and it seems to him all the more necessary, since the generality of those who promote these movements scarcely raise it." The reasons they give for such definition seem quite inadequate. And Dom Stolz adds the following reflection: "New certainty on a fact of faith, profounder knowledge of the divine economy, increase of light to instruct the unbelieving. What more do we yet know? Certainly many of the reasons adduced do not touch the basis of the problem." That reflection is all the more memorable because it is a Benedictine monk who makes it.

These reflections represent the earnest endeavour of a learned theologian to restrain the dogmatizing aspirations of popular piety. There is a tendency to draw conclusions from what may be thought appropriate for Deity to do. The idea finds favour that what God has the power to do, and is becoming for Him to do, He has accordingly done. It is summed up in the celebrated phrase: *potuit, decuit, ergo fecit.* But that maxim assumes a capacity in the human mind to determine what course is appropriate for the divine intelligence to adopt. That assumption cannot be substantiated. For it is a capacity which the human mind does not possess.

Memory at once recalls the haunting words of three illustrious English thinkers: the warning of Bishop Butler that we have not

faculties for this kind of speculation—we are far from being able to judge what particular disposition of things would be most friendly and assistant to virtue; the reminder of Archbishop Bramhall: "Christians should argue thus: Christ formed the Church thus, therefore it is the best form; not thus: this is the best form, therefore Christ formed His Church after this manner." We must not start with an ideal and impose it upon the facts, but start with the facts and infer their implications.

Above both the splendid sentences of Richard Hooker: "Dangerous it were for the feeble brain of man to wade far into the doings of the Most High; whom although to know be life, and joy to make mention of His name; yet our soundest knowledge is to know that we know Him not as indeed He is, neither can know Him: and our safest eloquence concerning Him is our silence, when we confess without confession His glory is inexplicable, His greatness above our capacity and reach. He is above, and we upon earth; therefore it behoveth our words to be wary and few" (Book I., chap. ii., par. 3).

The characteristic difference between the Latin and the Greek with regard to theological development, the readiness of the one to increase its Dogmas, the reluctance of the other, is admirably drawn out by Dom Anselm Stolz and Professor Bulgakoff. It must certainly affect the prospects of Reunion. It is difficult to see how the Orthodox East could unite with the advocates of extensive new Dogmatic Definitions, especially if those Definitions are based on a theology of the Appropriate, and above all, if such a theology is required of every Christian to be believed on peril of exclusion from the Church. It has, however, to be remembered that both these tendencies, the readiness and the reluctance to define, exist within Catholicism itself. The one is represented by Manning's words: "Since when was it inopportune to define a Truth?" The other is represented by Newman's words: "When has definition of doctrine *de fide* been a luxury of devotion, and not a stern necessity?" Much will depend on whether the Manninglike readiness to define or the Newmanlike reluctance prevails in the Latin Church. In the one case it will be drawn nearer to the Greek Church, in the other it will become more estranged. Both Latins and Greeks agree in the necessity of Dogmatic Definition. But the latter hold that although a theological conclusion may be true, it by no means follows that it ought to be raised to a Dogma indispensable to salvation.

We have, of course, only touched on the fringe of the momentous subject of Development in Religious Thought. It

would be very desirable, and extremely interesting, if a Greek theologian would express his mind on Dom Anselm's conciliatory essay. Meanwhile gratitude is due to the Benedictine's explanations.

W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON.

RELIGION AND INSTITUTIONS*

THIS psalm is the noblest expression in literature of a point of view to which I wish to draw your attention for a few minutes. You will notice that in the mind of the psalmist the city of Jerusalem, the political capital of the Jewish people, "the seat of judgment: the seat of the house of David," is inseparably associated with the worship of the temple. "Thither the tribes go up to testify unto Israel; to give thanks unto the name of the Lord." To him political loyalty is identical with devotion to the religion of the State. "Because of the house of the Lord our God I will seek to do thee good."

Why did the psalmist rejoice when they said to him, "We will go into the house of the Lord"? Not primarily because he hoped by worshipping God to deepen his own spiritual life or to raise his own moral standard, but because he wished to testify that the community to which he belonged was founded on religion. All members of the Jewish race thought of the temple-worship as a symbol of their national unity. They participated in it in order to bear witness that the Jewish state was no mere secular institution, and that all Jews were members of a holy society. They felt in the words of our Prayer Book that they belonged to "the blessed company of all faithful people."

This idea was not peculiar to the Jews, but was characteristic of the Graeco-Roman world with which they so often came into conflict. In the days of the Greek city-state, the distinction between Church and State, so familiar to us, was unknown. The test of good citizenship was loyalty, not only to the political institutions, but to the religion of the community. The welfare of the State was held to be dependent on the due performance of religious rites in honour of the god or gods under whose protection the city was placed. Any open disrespect to these religious observances was an act of impiety.

* An address given in the chapel of University College, Oxford, on January 19, 1936, by G. H. Stevenson, Fellow and Senior Tutor. "For my brethren and companions' sakes I will wish thee prosperity. Yea, because of the house of the Lord I will seek to do thee good" (Ps. cxxii. 8-9.)

Even in a sceptical age like the later fifth century B.C., the mutilation of the Hermæ was at once attributed to political revolutionaries. Such a flagrant outrage to the religion of the State could only be the work of men who were plotting to subvert its constitution.

At the time when the Christian Church was in its infancy these lesser loyalties to particular cities had largely been merged into a wider loyalty to the empire of Rome. Roman statesmen were well aware that their rule would not be secure unless it were invested with some kind of divine consecration. They knew that the obvious benefits which they conferred on the world by the establishment of the "Roman Peace," by promoting freedom of intercourse, and by providing facilities for political and economic advancement, would not by themselves secure the loyalty of their subjects. It was essential that the authority of Rome should make some appeal to the religious emotions. Accordingly, when Augustus attempted to found a new and happier era he assumed the rôle of a religious reformer, rebuilt temples and re-established rites which had fallen into neglect. The court poets were instructed to attribute the miseries from which the Emperor had saved the world to disregard of religion:

> **Delicta maiorum immeritus lues**
> **Romane, donec templa refeceris**
> **Aedesque labentes deorum et**
> **Foeda nigro simulacra fumo.**

But the Italian cults to which Horace refers made little appeal to Gauls and Spaniards, to Syrians and Egyptians, and the Roman Emperors found it necessary to go farther and make some claim to personal divinity. They established throughout the provinces centres of the cult of "Rome and Augustus," at which their subjects might, under religious forms, bear witness to their loyalty to the imperial system. The emperors themselves did not, as a rule, take these claims to divinity very seriously, but they could think of no other method of conferring on their rule the divine sanction, which according to ancient ideas it was essential that it should possess. The institution of Emperor-worship is not unintelligible to those who are familiar with the language applied to their dictators by contemporary Germans and Italians.

It is well known that this institution brought the early Christians into conflict with the Roman government, because of the rigid monotheism which they had inherited from the Jews. Humane Roman officials like Pliny could not understand why the Christians objected to observances which were regarded as merely a formal expression of loyalty. But it is

a mistake to suppose that the early Church regarded the State as a purely secular institution. New Testament writers shew no want of respect for the political system under which they lived. It was, however, one thing to say "the powers that be are ordained of God," and quite another to identify an emperor, however beneficent, with God Himself. Christians were quite prepared to regard even a pagan state as a divine institution and its rulers as servants of God. What they could not tolerate was the claim of men, however eminent, to be themselves divine.

My reason for asking you to listen to these remarks on the connection between religion and institutions in the ancient world is that they have a bearing on a problem which confronts every one of us. Is it possible for us moderns to follow the ancients in regarding the institutions of which we are members—not only the State, but the family, the school, and the college—as possessing an essentially religious character? Some answer to this question must be given by all members of an Oxford College such as this, where the chapel and the hall stand side by side, and where, until recent times, all members of the College were expected to attend the chapel services. There is surely a profound significance in the proximity of two buildings in one of which we meet each evening for a common meal while in the other the Eucharist is celebrated, and all who will come are welcomed at the Table of the Lord. The Chapel is no excrescence on the life of the College. The conduct of its services is the special duty of one of the Fellows, and not infrequently a lay Master or one of his lay colleagues have spoken in it, as I am doing tonight. Those of you who have been at Public Schools are familiar with the point of view which I am stressing, and I would ask you not to abandon it without considering all that can be said in its favour.

Though we are often told that what is called "institutional religion" makes no appeal at the present day, there can be no doubt that it still has a considerable hold on the average Englishman. There is little active hostility to organized religion, and most people have recourse to it on the great occasions of their family life. They bring their children to church to be baptized, and ask for the services of the clergy at weddings and funerals. They are glad that a royal coronation, for instance, is an ecclesiastical function. It is felt to be seemly to recognize God and to ask His blessing on important occasions in the life of the family and of the State. There is much in all this which is akin to the kind of feeling which I have described as existing in antiquity. It is based on a conviction, if the word is not too strong, that it is through

such institutions as the State and the family that God's purposes are fulfilled, and that they rest on a Divine sanction and not on mere human convenience.

A sharp distinction can be drawn between the attitude which I have attempted to describe and a conception of religion which is familiar among Protestants, but which is not unknown in the Roman Catholic Church. According to this view religion is a personal matter. The religious man may obtain help from institutions, but the more religious he is the more he is independent of them. The ideally religious man is the mystic, the man of "religious genius" whose life is so interpenetrated with the divine that he has no need of sacred, still less of secular, institutions. In practice, it is admitted, such men are rare, but on this view the object of the Church is to foster a type of personal piety of which the mystics are the supreme example.

It would be absurd to assert that this view is without value, but my present purpose is to emphasize its limitations. Most of us learn from experience the truth of the old saying that man is a political animal, and that it is only as members of a society for whose welfare we work that we can attain either personal happiness or that self-realization which is so commonly held to be the end of human activity. Surely it is a mistake to dissociate religious emotion from the feelings of love and devotion which are inspired in us by the societies to which we belong. Surely it is right to view *sub specie æternitatis* the institutions which have made our life worth living.

A variation of this view is that an interest in religion is a kind of personal idiosyncrasy, and that an individual may have a taste or a gift for religion, just as he may or may not have a taste or gift for art or music. It is extremely doubtful whether this analogy is legitimate, but granted that there *is* some analogy between religion on the one hand and art and music on the other, the conclusions which are drawn by those who use it do not follow. Those who have had most experience of artistic and musical education agree that it is wrong to think of individuals as wholly unmusical or wholly inartistic. No doubt some people are more gifted in these respects than others, but it is certain that, given proper training, a reasonably high level of appreciation of music and art can be reached by every normal man.

Even if religious geniuses, like artistic and musical geniuses, are rare, it is a mistake to base one's view of the place of religion in life on the assumption that only, so to speak, the highly gifted are concerned with it. Such a view is hopelessly out of accord with the spirit of the New Testament and leads straight

to priggish sectarianism. It was the adoption of some such attitude which in the seventeenth century caused the Puritans to lose their hold over the mass of the English people, and which many times since then has weakened the influence of groups of well-meaning people who have demanded too much of human nature. It seems to me that the only way of saving religion from many of its friends is to recognize that, admirable as saints and mystics may be, they are exceptional people. The wiser course is to attempt to make more positive, more intelligent, and less sentimental, the tolerant and even friendly attitude towards religion which still prevails in this country.

How can this best be done? Obviously there is room for improvement in religious education. Christianity, unlike the mystery religions of antiquity with which it has often been compared, is based on history. It accepts the truth of certain historical events, and claims to possess a body of revealed knowledge. Much can be done by making more intelligent the teaching of what is commonly called Divinity. But this is not the aspect of the question which I wish specially to emphasize. It seems to me essential that if the importance of religion in everyday life is to be recognized, religious worship should be closely associated with education. I am old-fashioned enough to feel that the saying of a grace at meals sweetens the social intercourse which follows, and that a short service in a school or college chapel is a good beginning to a day.

We who belong to the English Church are fortunate in possessing a liturgy which expresses in magnificent language the thoughts and aspirations which have inspired Christian Englishmen during four centuries, and whose roots run back to a period long preceding the Reformation. To me nothing is more moving than to hear the bells of a village church summon the inhabitants to prayer, and to know that when they assemble they will listen to no extempore effusions, but will join in words which have brought peace and strength to many generations of their predecessors. In our liturgy we possess an anchor which will save the English Church from being driven upon the rocks. In an age of muddled thinking the English liturgy stands for thoughts and values which have stood the test of centuries, and illuminates ultimate problems of human life and destiny which science does not pretend to solve. Do not let us tamper with our liturgical tradition in the interests of what is called modern thought. The language of the Prayer Book is no more out of date than that of Shakespeare, and its ideas are as well able as those of the poet to appeal to the man of today.

The point of view which I have tried to express is perhaps

more characteristic of the middle-aged than of the young. At your age it is natural to question established institutions and beliefs, and it is only reasonable that you should wish to exercise your minds in religious controversy. May I ask you not to assume too readily that all the clever men are on the anti-Christian side, and to believe that the views of trained theologians on religious questions are at least as well worth considering as those of scientists and journalists. In an age of specialism, religion is perhaps the only subject on which the views of amateurs are given a more than respectful hearing.

But my main object has been to invite you to ask yourselves whether we are justified in considering that founders of colleges were wrong in regarding the chapel as no less essential a part of their buildings than the dining-hall. The charm of Oxford life consists largely in the opportunities which it provides for friendly intercourse within the walls of a college between men whose tastes, interests, and origins are very varied. May we not regard the chapel as a symbol of college unity? Attendance at its services is consistent with great divergences of opinion. All that it implies is that we are prepared to follow in the steps of those who thought that the activities of college life should be consecrated to God.

"For my brethren and companions' sake I will wish thee prosperity: because of the House of the Lord our God I will seek to do thee good."

G. H. STEVENSON.

THE JOB OF A SCHOOL CHAPLAIN

A PAPER READ TO A GROUP OF UNDERGRADUATES

YOU have asked me to tell you something about my job, and so far as modesty permits I shall try to do what you ask. It is a curious thing, but in this world so full of unemployment, while there are plenty of prospective schoolmasters to be found, and plenty of parsons, those who combine the two are a comparative rarity. It was not so thirty years ago. Then, perhaps, a third of the staff of the greater public schools were ordained as a matter of course, because they were schoolmasters rather than because they had any distinctively priestly offices to perform. Even just after the war there were always several parsons to be found on the staff of any school, besides the chaplain (if one was called chaplain) and probably the headmaster. Now it is the exception rather than the rule to find a parson-headmaster, and certainly exceptional to find more than

one or two clergy on the staff of any school. (If I speak of "public" schools, I use the term in the generally accepted sense, and because they are the only schools which really come within my experience.) But the connection between the Church and education in England has always been very close indeed, and I, for one, would not willingly see that connection lost.

I suppose that those who feel they are called to the priesthood begin to realize their vocation in many different ways. Forgive me if I am wrong here; many of you, who have already professed your intention of being ordained, will be able to speak on this subject better than I. But I suppose that the one motive which is common to all is the pastoral; the intention to fulfil Christ's command to feed His sheep. The office of a priest is first and foremost that of the pastor, and that whether he professes High or Low Church opinions, whether he speaks of Mass, the Eucharist, Holy Communion, or the Lord's Supper; whether he refers to the Altar or the Holy Table; whether he is Catholic or Protestant, Liberal or Fundamentalist. What a lot of labels we can attach to ourselves and each other in this connection! And what a lot of questions we can beg (forgive me again) by so doing!

The pastoral office of the parish priest is familiar to most of you. His job does not merely consist in the ministry of Christ's Word and Sacraments, in his church; but he has also to go out into the highways and hedges, and continue his ministrations and his shewing-forth of Christian love in the homes of his parishioners. That is no easy task. In a large town parish of some thousands of inhabitants it will always be very difficult for the parish priests (the more so in these days of few curates) to know and be known. He has to combine extensive and intensive methods—wide visiting, I mean, combined with a fuller knowledge of, and perhaps a fuller service to small groups, such as boys' and girls' clubs, Scouts, Guides, Mothers' Union, and societies of all sorts. He will visit the sick, pray with, and administer the Blessed Sacrament to, them and to the dying, baptize the babies, marry and bury his parishioners, and use all the other occasional offices of the Prayer Book. Added to that, his task will be considerably lightened if he has developed habits of business-like efficiency. Nor have I forgotten that the primary motive without which none of his many varying jobs will be well done, can only be supplied by his own private devotion and study; unless he is in the true sense a man of faith and prayer, he will find his work loses most of its effectiveness.

All this you know already, from many sources. Then I suppose you think to yourself of the life of a schoolmaster as

you have known it from your own school days, and you wonder how far it can be connected with the life of a pastor as I have suggested that ought to be lived. You think to yourself of the drabness of teaching the same subjects year after year, to boys who cannot differ very much from each other; of growing older doing the same jobs over and over again, hearing the same pieces of Virgil or Livy being translated, with detentions for those who have not done their preparation properly, nor been sufficiently ingenious in finding an excuse for leaving it undone, and an occasional use of the cane to keep standards high. Of course it is dull sometimes; but as a matter of fact dullness is largely prevented by the fact for which you have as yet made no allowance—that although you may be teaching the same things, you are not teaching the same boys, and their reactions to the same lessons will always differ enormously and set you always new problems.

"But is this, even when combined with an occasional service in chapel, really pastoral work?" you are saying. Such teaching as I have described—and I was thinking mainly of the secular subjects which fall to a form-master's lot—is not, I admit, religious education strictly so called. "Now I can see," you will say, "that the teaching of Divinity, or Scripture, or whatever it is called nowadays, is a parson's job; I cannot see that teaching such secular subjects has anything to do with me *qua* parson."

The practice varies very much in different schools. Some now like to have one parson only on the staff, and to give him the minimum of actual teaching; to give him complete charge of the chapel services (this does not generally include permission to change them according to his own ideas, I may quickly add!), and to expect him to fill up the rest of his time by visiting the sick in their houses, adding the domestic staffs to those who are included in his ministrations, and (what will and should be a full-time job for some portion of the year) the preparation of candidates for Confirmation. I have not tried this sort of chaplaincy; it has its attractions for many, especially in the Woodard schools; but I should have thought that there was, at any rate, a theoretical danger of losing touch with all but a few of the most devout of those in the school—in fact, of keeping a hold on those who need you least and losing those who need you most. In practice, I think things do not generally work out this way: at least I know they do not with those of my friends and acquaintances who so regard their office. For myself, I do feel that the more intensive knowledge of such boys as pass through my form (I am a form-master myself, teaching a middle-school classical form) enables me to make

friends with them rather well; I know them pretty well by the end of a term in my form, and I think they know me too—they certainly know my weak points; and I value this particular form of contact very greatly. I would add that I try to make as many other contacts as I can, through games, school societies, and by taking part in as many school activities as my own physical and intellectual powers permit.

Here are a few ways in which life in one of these curiously self-sufficient little societies is carried on. I should be inclined to put the fight against this self-sufficiency in the forefront of a chaplain's duties. Everything favours the school becoming a microcosm, a little world of its own. The corporate loyalties, such as they are, rarely go beyond the school. If you tell them that their religion, if anything can, ought to fill them with a sense of duty to the whole community, you will find some response, though small. Most schools do a great deal of social work nowadays, and you will find that they have some sense of their duty towards their neighbour. But I have yet to find the school where that sense of a larger whole has spread to religion. The idea that their duty to God unites them with worshippers in the whole Catholic Church is a strange one to them. We hear many complaints that the public-school class does not support its parish churches; and there is some truth in the complaints. That will not begin to change until the public schools stress the fact that the school chapel is not merely the school chapel, part of the curriculum, a place of assembly, it may be, once a day and twice on Sundays, with masters to look over a list of names and see that every boy is there; but also the place where loyalty to school and duty to the time-table is transcended, and worship is offered to God in company with the whole Church, as the supreme duty of man.

That raises some very difficult questions which I am not going to try to answer now. If I have implied a criticism on the schools for not doing their duty in one respect, let me go on to imply some criticisms of parish life too. The schoolmaster-parson is in an atmosphere conducive to study; and he is in the midst of people accustomed to use their reasoning powers and to argument. He will certainly have to give reasons for his faith. He will meet all varieties of that faith, and if he cannot answer such questions as are put to him by boys or colleagues (or perhaps explain how they are unanswerable), I think he will fail in his duty. On the other hand, time for study is not so easy to find in term-time. But there are always the holidays. He will sometimes envy the parish priest who can settle down to a morning's work at his desk, while the schoolmaster spends the whole morning in school; on the other

hand, I have no doubt that the parish priest will reply that it is not so easy to keep his mornings free for study, when a continual stream of visitors look in for a talk, with the sure knowledge that they will find the vicar at home in the middle of the morning.

Of course, the continual study of what he professes is an essential part of the priest's duty. There is at least one other matter, in which the help of friendly criticism will frequently ensure the school chaplain's comparative efficiency. If his congregation cannot hear him, they will always tell him so. Clerical inaudibility seems to me (I do not think I am growing deaf) to be on the increase. I cannot understand how any priest can consider he has done his duty unless the whole of his congregation can hear the whole service. Some may reply that the congregation has the service before them, and can follow it as they will. This may do for a trained congregation of adults, but it certainly will not do for boys. But, fortunately, in a school chapel inaudibility is always obvious. If they cannot hear you the boys will fidget and the masters will tell you afterwards; you will not get this very often from a grown-up congregation; it would be better if you did.

I am not going to speak to you now of the sort of sermons we get in a school chapel,* except only to say that they vary enormously in subject-matter and utility. It is the custom in most schools for chaplains and headmasters to preach once, twice, or three times in the course of the term, and to fill up the remaining Sundays with preachers from outside. A single sermon to a congregation you do not know is, it may be, the most difficult form of preaching. But if you ever have to do it, you may be quite sure that your congregation has not had enough of that type of teaching which convicts of sin. We are all losing our sense of sin nowadays; and a right sense of dependence on God and a right appreciation of His saving love for mankind will not be reborn in us until that sense of horror at our own sinful lives is restored. Of course, there are different ways of arousing that sense of sin, some good, some bad. Conversion is necessary for all of us, but I for one am convinced that a conversion which depends entirely on emotional appeal is almost useless. But conversion there must be: and so I leave this suggestion with you for what it is worth, for your use, should you ever be called upon to preach in your own or other school chapels.

We—all parsons—are all teachers; some of us teach in one way, some another. Teaching the young is easier than teach-

* Readers of THEOLOGY will find some remarks of mine on the subject in the number for July, 1935.

ing the old (how often these latter resent being taught !), and so I suppose in some ways my job is easier than that of the parish clergy. However, in other ways they have the advantage of me, and so the balance probably works out evenly; but both sorts of teaching are very necessary.

I hope that I have told you what you wanted to know about my job. May I conclude by saying that I have told you of my ideal rather than of my practice; none can know better than I do that I frequently fail in many of the objects which I have set before you.

W. K. OLDAKER.

MISCELLANEA

CORRESPONDENCE

THE AGE FOR CONFIRMATION

SIR,

Have we any right to be debating—unless it be with a view to a future edition of the Prayer Book—at what age children should be confirmed ?

I have never been able to understand how the English bishops persuaded themselves that they were at liberty to override the plain directions of the Prayer Book, which—in addition to other clear statements such as the final exhortation of the Baptismal Service—fixes the age for Confirmation definitely within the *years of discretion*—a well-understood legal term signifying the period between seven and fourteen years of age.

I was myself confirmed at the age of thirteen by Bishop Pepys of Worcester. Later in the day, in conversation with my father, on learning my age, he declared that had he known it before the service, he would most certainly have refused to confirm me.

It may be of interest to record that Bishop Abraham (senior), first Bishop of Wellington, New Zealand, told me in 1870 or thereabouts, that in his judgment the age favoured by most Bishops—fifteen to eighteen—was just the very worst time for it—so much so that if children were not confirmed before that period, it would be better to defer confirmation until after it.

Yours faithfully,
J. WYLDE.

THE COUNTRY PARSON AND HIS FAILURES

SIR,

Your correspondent's experience is far from singular, except that he has been unfortunate in having had to wait so many years before catching a note of sympathy. For it is impossible for anybody to live in a rural diocese without seeing much that looks like a gradual collapse not only of religious life in our villages, but of secular healthiness as well. Think of the utterly baffling problem of the "common or garden" omnibus, that wafts the young rustics miles away to the cinemas every Sunday and to the least desirable ingredients of town life ! Think, too—for we must not forget—what is meant by the undeniable fact that contraceptives are sold without check to millions of unmarried boys and girls !

May I, with all diffidence, try to supplement your editorial note in the January number; that we may remind ourselves that Hope is one of the three great Christian virtues ? What grounds of hope are there in trials like these ? Let us look first to the Scriptures, and at once we learn the difference between false and true optimism. False optimism tries to make out that the facts are not so bad after all. The truth is they are a great deal worse. The true optimist sees ground for hope in this same grim fact. It surely is for our encouragement that our Lord

foretold all our failures. That is the truth which we learn from the tremendous words, "few there be which find it." More than His words His actions are eloquent with the same truth: for the Crucifixion is the time when Christ was glorified. Nothing short of that utter self-abasement could have caused any of the stiff-necked nation to walk down from Calvary beating their breasts in penitence.

And then St. Paul must have meant what he said: "Rejoice in the Lord alway; and again I say, Rejoice." For he knew that though he had "laboured more abundantly than they all" much of his work judged by common sense ended in failure. I think it was in one of Dean Farrar's books that a vivid picture is drawn of the Apostle confined in Rome waiting for his martyrdom and hearing news of his far-off converts falling away from the faith; torn by "grievous wolves." What that must have meant to him we learn from 2 Cor. ii. The agony of mind which he went through was brought on him by the news of very ordinary bickerings and partisanship among his "children."

The Old Testament is no less emphatic. Considering when they lived, there is no more astonishing fact in history than that the three greatest prophets, Ezekiel, Jeremiah and Isaiah, should have begun their life's work with the certainty of failure. Imagine Jeremiah knowing how his predecessors had fared facing the awful prospect of some forty years of witnessing to the Truth of God, when every word he uttered brought on him shame, derision and martyrdom! By their lives they foretold the suffering Messiah, who alone among the religious reformers of the world made it clear to His followers that their obedience to Him was to draw upon them the violent antagonism of rulers and patriots, and to be received by the cold indifference of the multitude. The early Christians teach us in the purest period of the Church's life—the period of persecution—that the power of the Holy Spirit is shewn not by visible success, but by *joyful* persistence in spite of failure. Light, too, is thrown on the situation today by R. M. Benson's penetrating remark: "The Church would have more visible success if our characters could stand it." This must have been in our Lord's mind when He uttered the tremendous warning at the end of the Sermon on the Mount: "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy Name; and in thy Name have cast out devils; and in thy Name done many wonderful works? And then I will profess unto them, I never knew you. Depart from me, ye workers of iniquity." Could there be a more triumphant test of the village parson's work than the casting out of devils in the Name of the Saviour?

But supposing we allow ourselves a little self-congratulation on the very rare occasions when we can be sure that Satan, through our work, has lost a human soul: what then?

There is danger, of course, in the abuse of the truth by rationalization. We are not to excuse the coldness of our hearts by the fact of failure being foretold or by its often being, apparently, the condition of victory. "They that sow in tears shall reap in joy." The agony in Gethsemane was the foreseeing by the Lord of the loss of many souls; and it would be better for all of us if we could weep over our villages as He wept over the rebellious city.

"The one fatal sin," Dr. Gore used to say, "is the ceasing to try." But how easy it is to slip into a rut and never get out of it: to spend the passing years regretting that I am not somewhere else! But when

circumstances forbid a change, is not God's Will thereby revealed? What did the great saint say to a younger brother who fancied his preaching was too good for his congregation? Two things, "Tell him his prayers will do more good than all his sermons," and "When we are where God wishes us to be we are next door to Paradise."

Lastly, what about our critical parishioners? Have we ever pleaded with them to use the Ember collects? If not, we cannot wonder that our task is not only difficult but impossible.

E. LYTTELTON.

NOTES

THE ANCIENT ROMAN RITE

EVERYONE knows that at the Stational Mass at Rome, during the centuries before and after St. Gregory the Great, the Pope was surrounded by numbers of priests, deacons, sub-deacons, and other ministers, and that this rite is the parent of the modern High Mass; but it has always been difficult for most of us to imagine how the service was ordered.

A book has lately appeared, *L'ancienne liturgie romaine: le rite lyonnais*, by Dom Denys Bruenner, O.S.B. (Emmanuel Vitte, éditeur, 3 place Bellecour, Lyon, and 10 rue Jean-Bart, Paris, 344 pp., 52 illustrations), which is a competent and scholarly study of the famous Lyons rite. This rite was formerly believed to be Oriental in origin, and legend derived it from St. Pothinus and St. Irenæus. In the eighteenth century it suffered considerable damage, through a series of efforts to assimilate it to the "Roman" usage. Now, however, the Lyons rite turns out to be nothing else than the pure rite of Rome itself, brought to Lyons by way of Metz at the refounding of the see under Charlemagne, between 800 and 810, and maintained with extraordinary conservatism by the canons of Lyons, while the usage of Rome changed.

The illustrations in the book include good reproductions of the admirable drawings of the Abbé Marduel, who knew the Lyons rite before the troubles of the French Revolution, and assisted in its restoration afterwards, and also some photographs taken at the Pontifical Mass on Maundy Thursday, 1934. These drawings and photographs shew the full rite, with seven acolytes, seven subdeacons, seven deacons, six priests (the *symmystæ* or con-celebrants who, it appears, on Maundy Thursday still con-celebrate), the Archbishop, and four other attendant priests, with the *Suisse* and three others who lead the procession in. During the Preparation, the sub-deacons and the acolytes go to places in the choir; the celebrant, the *symmystæ*, and the deacons form a long line across the sanctuary, the chief deacon being on the Archbishop's right. The Collect is said by the Archbishop from his throne in the centre of the apse behind the altar; his priests are to right and left; the deacons are still in a line in front of the altar. This picture and that of the Preface seem to take us back most nearly to ancient Rome. At the Preface there is a splendid grouping. The ministers surround the altar on all four sides—to the east the sub-deacons; flanking them, the acolytes, facing north and south; at the altar, along the north and south sides, the *symmystæ*; to the west, the deacons, as before. The other assistant priests

are behind the archbishop, to right and left; but he is no longer, as in the Roman basilicas, on the far side of the altar. Other pictures shew the general communion, and the sacred species being carried away after the service for reservation, by a cortege of seventeen persons. On days when the full number of ministers do not officiate, there can be five, three, or one of each grade.

The author quotes a remark of Rousseau, who was present on one Easter Day: "Great God, if these men honour You in their hearts as they do outwardly, it would be impossible to offer You a worship more worthy of Your majesty."

A. G. HEBERT, S.S.M.

NOTE ON ST. MATTHEW XIX. 3-12

ALTHOUGH I dislike controversy, especially upon such a subject, I cannot allow the criticism of my anonymous note to go unanswered.

Firstly, let me make it clear that my object was not to attack celibacy but to uphold a high ideal of marriage. In so far as some of the teaching on celibacy has been detrimental to a truly Christian view of marriage, it needs balancing by an equally strong emphasis on marriage as a sacrament and a divine institution. Few would deny that there is a vocation to marriage no less than to celibacy. My main contention is that the idea that marriage is inferior to celibacy is based on the teaching of St. Paul and not of Christ.

I cannot see that my critic has answered the objections that I brought against the usual interpretation of the passage Matt. xix. 3-12. He merely restates it, disregarding the inconsistencies to which I drew attention.

He objects to my speaking of marriage as God's will for man or as an ideal. Can he deny that marriage is a divine institution, and is therefore in accordance with God's will? I can only repeat that truly Christian marriage is an ideal. It is one which no one has yet reached, since a perfect marriage would require a perfect husband and wife. It is something far more than mere conjugal fidelity, though apparently some of the disciples thought even this standard was too severe. Some "Christians" think of marriage merely as a legal institution, but Christ always set a spiritual ideal before men because God is satisfied with nothing less than perfection. The celibate, of course, is also aiming at a praiseworthy ideal, but not a better one. His asceticism admittedly entails self-sacrifice, but I suppose no Christian takes the view that marriage does not require an equal readiness for self-sacrifice and self-control.

But there appear to be some who take St. Paul's view that marriage is for those who "have not the gift of continency." My critic writes: "I am humbly thankful to stand with St. Paul in this matter" (*i.e.*, the question of celibacy), and he does not think that Christ could have advised those unable to live up to the Christian ideal of marriage to abstain from it. Evidently he imagines that Christ would have agreed with St. Paul that the incontinent should use the sacrament of marriage as an outlet, lest a worse thing befall them (*e.g.*, fornication or "burning," 1 Cor. vii.). I cannot think that this is the Christian view of marriage, and it is no more absurd to tell an incontinent man that he

should abstain from marriage than to tell a rich young man to give up his possessions. In each case asceticism is the only way of curing a besetting sin.

My suggestion that the concluding phrase, "He that is able to receive it, let him receive it," is parallel to the saying, "he that hath ears to hear, let him hear," and may have been inserted here by the Evangelist has the support of Dr. A. H. McNeile (*cf.* his *Commentary on St. Matthew*). Moreover, if it is true that the "editorial providence of God" (p. 108) would never have permitted such a misleading addition, how are we to explain why it failed to prevent the insertion of the Matthean gloss "except for fornication"? Or, if we accept the gloss, then Christ's denunciation of divorce is not so uncompromising as my critic believes (p. 107).

But the issue is clear. It is a choice between the teaching of Christ and that of St. Paul. The latter clearly thought of marriage as inferior to celibacy. I firmly believe that Christ did not hold this view. If Christians decided that He did, one course of action and only one would be justified. Those who aim at perfection (as we are all told to do) would be bound to abstain from marriage. And that would mean that all good men would shun matrimony and parentage, and the all-important vocation of bringing into the world souls destined for eternal life would be left to those who could not or would not accept the teaching of Christ!

V. A. HOLMES-GORE.

DR. EISLER

THE following is from the private letter of a very eminent scholar, not a theologian, but a man who is very well acquainted with the subjects of which Dr. Eisler treats.

"I, too, saw and was amused at *The Times* report of Eisler's lecture. There is really no need to take it seriously. Between ourselves he is, though a very learned man in his way, a complete fool and without any critical faculty that I can discover. He has really nothing to go on in this new theory except conjecture, and personally I do not believe a word of it. He is, as you can see, extremely ingenious and most fertile of ideas. He will dish you up an elaborate theory, complete with all accessories, at five minutes' notice, and he has an ample store of knowledge to furnish buttresses, but the buttresses don't support the fabric, and a breath of common sense will blow the whole thing down. Such, at least, is my own conviction.

At all events, you can take it from me that there is no *papyrus* evidence beyond what you know."

S. C. C.

REVIEW

ADVERSUS JUDÆOS. By A. Lukyn Williams, D.D. Cambridge University Press. 25s.

This is a useful book on a subject which ought to become a primary one for interpreters of the New Testament if ever we are to learn the content of the revelation of our Lord. Where its writer moves with ease it is a pleasant and scholarly book; where he is not at home the book suffers as any other would. Certainly a book was needed on the large literature which can be put under the designation *Adversus Judæos*. My former colleague, Dr. Rendel Harris, was as percipient as is usual with him when he wrote in the Preface to the second of the two volumes on the subject we did together, that the next duty was to publish a series of important texts. Canon Williams has not done this; that task remains. He has given us "A Bird's-eye View of Christian *Apologia* until the Renaissance," as his sub-title says. He reviews the books of fourteen centuries, that is to say. Now there are two terms in that description of his which ought to be picked out. His "bird's-eye" seems to have had two different foci. Distance and haste appear to have set his viewpoint when dealing with the early literature of his subject, leisure and happy acquaintanceship when treating the later books, and especially the Spanish ones. This focal difference has had its influence not only upon the scale of the book, but also upon its total treatment. The second term is *Apologia*. It fits some of his later literature. That the anti-Nicene books can be so described is very much to be doubted; the technical term does not fit their simpler purpose. Canon Williams could have prepared his own way in this matter had he written a truly critical introduction. This is essential for any study of *Anti-Judaica*, since we have yet to understand how and when and why such literature arose. The somewhat hurried notes he has put together in his first chapter serve to becloud rather than illuminate those important questions.

The theory which at present attempts to answer them is, in a word or two, this: that in the period before the actual penning of the New Testament writings there was a *florilegium* of Old Testament passages which was drawn upon, rather than the text of the Old Testament itself, to attest certain phases of the revelation of our Lord. This collection had an

anti-Judaic edge, as the use of Isaiah in Matt. xiii. exemplifies. To that collection the name "The Book of Testimonies" has been given. Our author is more concerned to pronounce this title a myth—a theme which recurs in his sparse thirteen pages of introduction—than he is to demonstrate adequately that such a collection had existed. Moreover, he goes on to assert with De Zwaan that there were "Books of Testimonies," and that in Acts xxvi. 22 *ff.* some of their "headlines" were actually cited, without any further critical treatment than the Dutch scholar's unsupported declarations. It is surely possible for another to describe these unaided opinions as "myth"; this is an instance of what is chiefly lacking in his book. Canon Williams has apparently not seen that some of us who have written on his subject have used the description "the *testimonia* mode" rather than "book" or "books." When, too, he proceeds to date the rise of those "books" as being "*circa* A.D. 45," though he may put a query after his statement, we are entitled to ask that he should give reasons why and how this potent agent had arisen so early in the history of Christian literature.

Our author deals with the development of *Anti-Judaica* much in the same manner. For instance, there is no discussion of its growth in dialogue-form from the second century to the late Byzantine Empire. Indeed, the many published dialogues have too few representatives in his "bird's-eye view." This lack of biological study misses the many which are still in manuscript, and especially the ancient and exemplary one in Florence. The dramatized form of these dialogues is not touched upon; it was popular in Byzantium. Here, again, a Syriac member of the group, which is in the library of New College, will be found to be an important link in the history of their rise. That, however, is hid with Constantine the Great, or with the literature which arose around that still enigmatic man. Unedited Arabic and Slavonic texts have as well to be given a place; there is also no treatment of the *Eclogæ* which has the name of Eusebius. Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* iv., is omitted strangely enough in a book on *Apologiæ*—a very big omission, seeing that his *Testimonia* text has unusual features which, in part, appeared in Theophilus of Antioch and again in Georgius Scholarius. The influence of another form of its text upon Clement of Alexandria is likewise passed over. Further, if there is a question of St. Matthew having been the author of a *Book of Testimonies*, and that we have it still under the name of Matthew Hieromonachos, it ought to have been given more space than five lines in a footnote. This question will involve, for example, a new comparative study of the transcript of

the Athos manuscript in the Rylands Library with *Cod. Barroc.* 33, and *Cod. Seld. Gr.* 44 in the Bodleian.

These *lacunæ* in texts and critical treatment are to be regretted, because Canon Williams might have disclosed some of the more essential factors in the study of *Anti-Judaica*. It has been my good fortune recently to discover the ancient Hebrew nucleus of this "mode," the actual nature of its usage in the revelation of our Lord, and resultantly the quality of its use in the New Testament. Its value for the study of fundamental things in the first century is as great as was claimed by Dr. Harris and myself some few years ago, but, now, in a totally different way. These matters cannot be enlarged upon in a short review. They illustrate what might have been done if the author's "bird's-eye view" of the elementary problems had not been so swift.

His felicitous handling of Spanish Latin literature, with some of its roots in mediæval Hebrew literature, would alone make the book worth while; he is at home in storied Seville and Huesca. Even here a grumble must lift its head. There was such a chance for Canon Williams to have traced the backbone of Isidore of Seville's *testimonia* to the controversial material embedded in earlier Hebrew literature. These controversies between Jew and Christian, which range from the second to the fourth centuries, form an almost unworked lode so far as Christian scholarship is concerned. The Jewish scholar, such as Marmorstein, has been at work there for some years with very large knowledge but more bias than light. Sometimes the footnotes look in the wrong direction. When commenting on Evagrius' *Altercatio* and its use of the name Pearl for our Lord, the annotator mentions Phœbadius. That is good. It is better, however, to cite the very early Syriac tract edited by Schäffer. The collocation of names at this point in Evagrius is patently and significantly Semitic; there is no call here to add to these instances. A complaint must be registered, however, against Canon Williams' *Epilogue*; it sums up his endeavour. It shews also that his commerce with the term "Apology" has led him to do some despite to the earlier writings he has examined. He says: "Christian writers, in their zeal for God and for the inspiration of His word . . . expected Jews to receive Haggada as direct evidence for the truth of Christian doctrines which were 'proved' by its means." Whether this judgment applies to the *Anti-Judaica* of the Middle Age is not in question. It ought not to be applied to the ante-Nicene books, since they are, for the most part, occupied with chosen Old Testament passages as a Semitic idiom for the carrying of the Christian revelation into

the minds of Semites. When all is said, it must be acknowledged that *Adversus Judæos* has large knowledge, its style is urbane, its purpose most useful and its achievement considerable. It is pleasant, also, to find an English book in these days which has true regard for the study of Patristics.

V. BURCH.

NOTICES

THE PASSION AND MARTYRDOM OF THE HOLY ENGLISH CARTHUSIAN FATHERS: THE SHORT NARRATION. By Dom Maurice Chauncy (1570). Edited by the Rev. G. W. S. Curtis. Church Historical Society. S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d.

We are all indebted to the piety of certain Old Carthusians in general, and of Father Curtis in particular, for the publication of this extraordinarily interesting and moving narrative of the sufferings of the monks of the London Charterhouse from 1535 to 1537. Chauncy, the author, had himself escaped the horrors of Tyburn by taking the oath of supremacy, together with Father Foxe, in the hope of saving the Charterhouse: events proved that they had been tricked. He subsequently escaped to Belgium, and returned to England under Mary, but was again driven into exile on the accession of Elizabeth. He died in 1581 at the Chartreuse of Paris, with the guilt of his excusable duplicity still heavy on his conscience.

Chauncy wrote, in addition to the *Historia aliquot nostri sæculi martyrum* (largely used by Froude), three other narratives of the sufferings of his brethren, of which this is the last and in some particulars the most complete. It is printed here for the first time from the unique MS. in the possession of the Rev. C. H. Bickerton Hudson. The translation has been admirably done by Mr. A. F. Radcliffe. There seems to be only one small discrepancy to call for comment. In 1535, after the execution of Prior Houghton, Cromwell put in charge of the Charterhouse "*duo seculares*," John Whalley and Jasper Tyloll. Mr. Radcliffe renders this "two seculars" (p. 107), whereas Miss Thompson, the learned historian of the English Carthusians, in her invaluable historical introduction, speaks of them as "two laymen" (p. 25). Canon Dixon, who gives a brilliant and vivid account of the whole episode in the first volume of his *History of the Church of England*, describes them simply as "two of Cromwell's servants" (p. 499), which indeed is how they described themselves. It certainly seems that Miss Thompson is correct in assuming that they were not priests.

Of all the martyrs who suffered under Henry VIII., the Carthusians are perhaps the most attractive. "Under the rule of John Houghton their prior, the Carthusian monks of the House of the Salutation of the Blessed Mary of London had not declined from the ancient discipline which had made their order renowned throughout the world. Their strict lives, their spare diet, their constant exercises, and the works of charity and mercy to which they were devoted, rendered them worthy representatives of the best days of monasticism. No treasonable designs, no political machinations, had ever been imputed to them: they had taken no part in the agitation caused by the Nun of Canterbury: no expression of opinion concerning the doings of the King and Parliament was known to have proceeded from them. They appear to have desired simply to keep their vows and to live in peace" (Dixon, i. 219). Unlike Bishop Fisher, they never engaged in treasonable negotiations with the

enemies of their King and country: unlike Sir Thomas More, they did not suffer from private intellectual crotchets. They were simple and single-hearted men, who perished horribly for conscience' sake. And this little volume is in all respects a worthy monument to their memory on the fourth centenary of their martyrdom. It has been admirably planned and put together; the illustrations are particularly well selected; and it may be strongly recommended to every student of the period as a compilation of more than ordinary merit and importance. The Foreword is contributed by Bishop Frere.

CHARLES SMYTH.

THE CATHOLIC FAITH IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS. By the Rev. F. G. Baring and the Rev. G. J. Ince. Williams and Norgate. 4s. 6d.

It is much to be hoped that this book will find its way into the hands of all headmasters, school chaplains, and parents. Written by two priests with wide experience in grappling with the problems and difficulties of school life, it shirks none of the issues involved, and in its criticism of "Public School Religion" is as vigorous on the constructive as on the destructive side. Here will be found thoughtful and suggestive discussion of such important and vexed questions as the most suitable age for Confirmation, the teaching of "divinity," the advantages and disadvantages of "outside preachers" in the school pulpit, eucharistic worship, and the help which the Sacrament of Penance can afford in the struggles and temptations of adolescence. The whole is a plea for the silencing of uncertain trumpets and the substitution of definite reasoned teaching in the place of nebulosity and vagueness. The task of the Public School is envisaged as that of equipping its sons not only with School certificates but also with the whole armour of God. It is not to be expected that the standpoint of the authors will be wholly endorsed by all their readers, but there is good ground for confidence that such as are sincerely interested in the training and spiritual welfare of "Christian Minor" will find here much food for thought and many helpful suggestions to aid them in their responsible task.

KENNETH MENZIES.

THE CLOISTER AND THE WORLD. By I. F. Coudenhove. Translated by H. E. Kennedy. Sheed and Ward. 3s. 6d.

In this book the author relinquishes the dialogue form of her earlier works and treats of the subject of Vocation in three letters—purely fictitious letters—one to a would-be postulant dissuading her from entering a convent; one to a nun on the day of her profession, congratulating her on having entered; and one to a girl who has tried the convent life and has abandoned it. To these is added a brilliant and delightfully written essay on St. Joan of Arc, "the Saint who took the world seriously."

The first of the letters will probably provoke some criticism, as it is generally recognized today that for a person to be strongly inclined to the religious life, and to be apparently qualified physically for it, and for superiors to be willing to accept such a would-be religious, itself constitutes a vocation. Nevertheless, young girls do need to be on their guard

against a too-easy belief that they are called to the religious life. A hastily formed desire to enter a convent should not be trusted, and normally a year at least should be allowed to elapse before the desire is taken seriously. At the same time it should be remembered that St. Thomas Aquinas says that God may give a vocation to a soul to spend only a short period in religion.

H. S. Box.

HISTORY OF MEDIÆVAL PHILOSOPHY. By Maurice De Wulf. Translated by E. C. Messenger. Vol. I. From the Beginnings to the End of the Twelfth Century. Third English edition. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

Until comparatively recently mediæval philosophy was regarded with some contempt. It was supposed that the Middle Ages did not contribute anything to the progress of human thought, that between the time of the Neoplatonists and the modern world there lay a bleak, barren blank—productive of nothing useful in the sphere of philosophy. Now it has come to be realized that as in the realms of literature, art, and architecture, so in that of philosophy, the Middle Ages were a period of magnificent achievement.

Dr. De Wulf is a disciple of the late Cardinal Mercier and a Professor at the University of Louvain. His *History of Mediæval Philosophy* is well known to students. The third English edition is based upon the sixth French edition and is practically a new work, as the author has remodelled it in deference to criticisms of previous editions, treating of the individual writers in a more objective way, and giving some synthetic studies only in the last part of the work.

H. S. Box.

IN THE FULNESS OF TIMES. A course of public lectures in the University of Leeds on the historical background of Christianity. By E. O. James, D.Litt. S.P.C.K. 4s.

One cannot but appreciate the spirit in which Professor James conceived the lectures here published. To quote from his Preface: "Somehow the results of scholarship must be made known to general audiences, and on broader lines than are possible or desirable within the confines of specialized research. It would seem to be within the function of a University, particularly if it happens to be situated in the midst of a thickly populated area, to make some provision for this wider dissemination of knowledge. . . . If, however, a scholar confines himself exclusively to his own independent investigations, it is not easy for him to avoid becoming technical and intensive, and possibly on occasion (be it whispered) discoursing at length on his own pet theories to the confusion of his uncritical audience. Indeed, balanced judgment is not infrequently more readily displayed when the trained mind deals with hypotheses not of its own devising." Surely these are words of wisdom, and we hope that many in positions akin to that of Professor James may ponder them. He himself has here broadened his brow to some purpose for us. The book gives evidence of a "balanced judgment," as well as of an impressively wide range of study outside the domains which the author has made specially his own.

It is perhaps those who strive themselves to lecture on the "Præparatio

Evangelica" who will be readiest to admire the skill which Professor James exhibits. His first chapter gives a general sketch of the Græco-Roman world of the age into which Christ came. The second deals with the two great spiritual movements of that world: the mighty current of Greek philosophical endeavour which had all but spent its force, and that fervent quest after personal salvation which assayed to find satisfaction in the strange polymorphous tangle of the Oriental mystery cults. It is on the mystery religions (here and in later chapters) and on the "Jewish background" (his next lecture) rather than on philosophical developments that Professor James is most illuminating; but he reveals throughout the book remarkable insight and masterly power of condensation. There follows an impressive chapter on "The Christ," wherein each in turn of the more recent critical hypotheses as to the facts underlying the gospels is incisively delineated. If the effectiveness of this fine lecture as an essay in objective history is modified by the intrusion of apologetic matter on the doctrinal significance of the Resurrection, this may perhaps be excused on the Biblical principle "in season and out of season." The chapters on "Saint Paul and the Mystery Religions" and on "Gentile Christianity" maintain the same high standard of interest and of judgment. If at the conclusion of the latter, wherein the conversion of Constantine is reached, we had been given an epilogue summarizing the whole, the book would have gained a unity which would have enhanced its helpfulness. It is not that the two following chapters, which carry us somewhat breathless down to the present era, are by any means devoid of interest. Indeed, each might well form the subject of a further valuable course of such "public lectures," wherein Professor James will consolidate the gratitude due to him from Everyman for this book. In that case he will prove even more helpful to us than he has done here, if he keeps within the boundaries of a single theme.

G. W. S. CURTIS.

CONTEMPLATIVE PRAYER. By Shirley Hughson, O.H.C. S.P.C.K. 6s.

If one may judge from the quantity of books now appearing on mysticism, the number of souls aspiring to the higher stages of prayer must be very much on the increase. Such books can be divided into three classes. The true seeker after God had better be extremely careful which kind of mystical literature he selects when he wants guidance on his path.

The first type of book is written by some initiate, adept or pseudo-mystic who guarantees that, if you will only follow his method, you will be able to consider yourself the equal of St. Teresa or St. John of the Cross in a few weeks' time. Various devices are suggested which, subtly or blatantly, feed your unconscious desire for spiritual self-aggrandizement. "Man," writes the author of a book which I have just declined to review for THEOLOGY, "walks boldly forth upon his pathway, declaring his own almightiness. . . . Man, instead of being a worm of the dust, is the centre of his own universe and heir to all that the big universe contains . . . when he lives one hundred per cent. of his true consciousness in harmony with cosmic law." You just meditate on that.

The second type ministers to intellectual curiosity and psychological self-inspection. It teaches people to examine their emotion states and

to classify their modes of prayer. Interesting, certainly, but extremely dangerous.

And then we have books written first of all for the glory of God, that He may be praised by the loving prayer of His children.

Father Hughson's little treatise on contemplative prayer may unhesitatingly be placed in the last category, and recommended as a safe and judicious guide. It is a book to buy, and to keep, and to use. Very simply and clearly written, it explains how all Christians should lead prayerful lives, and to what heights they may indubitably rise. Contemplative prayer is not the exclusive possession of a few chosen souls, and no one need be discouraged because he feels he has no exceptional gifts. Father Hughson encourages every man to set about prayer in a serious and earnest manner, and, like a wise director, instructs, heartens, warns, calms, and inspires.

As for "extraordinary" prayer—visions, raptures, and so forth—he leaves them entirely on one side. On the whole, the book gains by the omission, for there is not a sentence in it which might pander to vain curiosity or to spiritual pride.

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

ON THEORY AND PRACTICE OF PENANCE. By Priests of the Anglican Communion. Edited by H. S. Box, D.D. S.P.C.K. 6s.

The welcome which this book has already received is a strong indication of its importance. It is a further contribution to the attempts which have been made to provide manuals for the training of Anglican priests for the work of the Confessional. Hitherto there has been little to turn to beyond Pusey's edition of Gaume, and the manuals of A. H. Baverstock and F. G. Belton, though Dr. Kirk has provided a basis for direction in his *Conscience and its Problems*.

The above work is, however, of a somewhat ambitious nature, covering as it does not only the provinces of moral and ascetic theology, but examining the theological and philosophical bases of Penance, unfolding its history, and giving directions for its practice. But the author would be the first to say that these essays are intended as no more than introductions. Of such, Dr. Box's chapter on the philosophical basis of moral theology is an admirable example, defending as he does the verdicts of the moral consciousness against modern attempts to explain it away. One wonders, however, whether this and Fr. Bede Frost's essay on the Dogmatic basis are not too far removed from the practical truths of the moral life on which the confessor requires illumination. Fr. Frost gives us a vigorous defence of the need of Dogma in general, but he hardly points to its application to the particular subject in question. No such objection, however, can be urged against the illuminating essay on Ascetic Theology contributed by Fr. Harton, who insists on the fact that the confessor is not merely the judge of the conditions to be satisfied before absolution can be given, but the pastor who is to "train souls aright in the ways of holiness," and incidentally deals with the question of the perfection which is required of every human soul, so ably discussed in a recent book by Mr. Norman Flew.

A still more practical aim is found in Dr. Langford James' chapter on the scope of Moral Theology; when basing his discussion on the Decalogue he touches on the everyday problems of euthanasia, contra-

ception and business veracity. If his treatment lacks depth, that may be due to the limitations of space in a work of this kind.

An admirable example of practical counsel based on wider principles is found in Dr. Sparrow Simpson's chapter on "Jurisdiction in Hearing Confessions," where a somewhat unpromising title leads to a discussion of the important questions of the safeguarding of Sacramental Confession from the blunders of the youthful and inexperienced priest, of the distinction between Order and Jurisdiction, of the rights of the Bishops in reserved cases. And the authorities appealed to are not merely the decrees of Trent or the *dicta* of theologians of the Counter-Reformation, but the practice of a Pusey and the pronouncements of Anglican bishops such as the valuable, if unexpected, regulations put out in the name of the late Bishop of Ripon.

The same attention to Anglican authorities is found in the second essay, where Fr. Biggart, C.R., shews with great skill and ability how the Sacrament of Penance may be presented to the average Englishman with his considerable, though declining, prejudices against it.

But combined with this we find the most difficult task of tracing the history of the doctrine and practice of this Sacrament throughout the ages, where reliance on a safe guide is practically impossible. For this is a subject where doctors and historians of unimpeachable orthodoxy differ widely, as any reader of Fr. Galtier's recent work will discover for himself. In this respect the practice of later ages differs so widely from that of the Primitive Church that the Protestant controversialist can easily present a case for denying that there is any connection between them.

To Fr. Baverstock many will feel so grateful for his earlier work on *The Priest as Confessor*, that they will read his lucid statement of the Theology of Penance with much interest, but with some regret that he seems to take no account of the difficulties raised by the criticism of the Old Testament, and dismisses so summarily any possible divergence between Anglican formularies and the teaching of the Western Church.

In the bibliographies given at the end of each chapter many would have welcomed some guide in selecting from such a wealth of material, especially in a book which is intended as a preface to further study.

There is one notable omission—namely, that of a chapter on Psychology as applied to the work of the confessor in the discernment and direction of souls. One can sympathize with antipathy to psycho-analysis with its doubtful hypotheses and the damage which it has caused in the hands of unwise or anti-religious practitioners. But no priest can afford to neglect the fresh light on the workings of the mind, conscious or subconscious, that is to be obtained from the works of McDougall and others.

If we have dwelt on defects in this book it must be remembered that they are largely inseparable from a composite work which covers so wide a field. We hope that it will be widely read and stimulate the clergy of the English Church to greater zeal for the knowledge of the art of guiding souls.

EDWARD SYMONDS, C.R.

THE BOOK OF JOB. Edited with an Introduction by A. Nairne, D.D. Cambridge University Press. 4s. 6d.

Canon Nairne is a lover of the beautiful, and we are not surprised to find, in his very attractive edition of the Book of Job, beautiful repro-

ductions of the engravings of William Blake. These engravings are a real help, for how, *e.g.*, can the discourses of Elihu be boring, when Blake's picture of the young man in his anger precedes them? The average man shrinks, it may be, from reading the Book of Job as a rather unsatisfying answer to the problem of innocent suffering, but Dr. Nairne would bid him read it quickly and eagerly and find its chief end in the conversion of the sufferer. Those who here found a solution of problems or the Cross can delight in the lovely poetry concerning Nature and Nature's God, in the home-coming of the soul, and even in the epilogue. In the Introduction is a guide to the place of Job in the sacred literature, and to the plan of the book, all the better for being brief: in it, too, are several original suggestions. Masterly side-notes accompany our reading and give us help in keeping pace with the thoughts of the writer.

F. W. FULFORD.

AN ENQUIRY INTO MORAL NOTIONS. By John Laird, F.B.A., LL.D. London: George Allen and Unwin. Pp. 318, 10s. 6d.

Professor Laird sets out in this book "to coax or to force the dominant vital and distinctive ethical notions to develop their meaning *vis-à-vis* one to another." In his *Study in Moral Theory* he took a more definite side and described himself, using a political term, as "an ethical unionist." That is to say, he recognized no *one* moral principle as capable of providing the foundation of ethics, and of supporting the others, but regarded moral principles as working together in a unity. But in this book he stands aside a keen and kindly critic and subjects each principle, that has claimed or claims today fundamental status, to the subtlest analysis.

The principles apart from which ethical science, he says, would cease to exist are the notions of virtue, duty and well-being, associated classically with Martineau, Kant and Mill. The theories, based on their dominance, bear the learned titles of Aretaics, Deontology, and Agathopœics. Professor Laird's task is to shew that it is impossible to eliminate the importance of a theory of virtue, or duty or well-being, from the vision of the moral ideal. The emergence of the new Intuitional School at Oxford, of which Prichard and Ross are representative, is strongly deontological, and teaches that the moral man knows or learns to know the right actions that will suit all situations in which he has to make a choice, irrespective of consideration of consequences; this present interest gives life and vividness to the professor's discussion of deontology, and is one of the occasions of his writing.

Virtue, Duty and Well-being occupy about equal portions of a work of 300 pages. In the first part we have a very tentative classification of the virtues, a discussion on "the heart and the head," in which knowledge of good and evil "can scarcely be denied to be of a rational kind," a chapter on the heart and the will, in which it is shewn that there is much in morality which is not a matter of will, and one on moral and non-moral virtue, between which it is acknowledged to be difficult to find a precise formula of difference.

In the second part the discussion centres on the will, and the relation between moral duty and moral motives, and all the problems of obligation; according to the new intuitionists motive has nothing to do with the morality of voluntary actions; moral and non-moral motives are here very

subtly analysed; Mr. Prichard's contention that obligations are discerned by *moral* not by non-moral logic, "underivative and immediate," is met in all its implications.

In the third part we are concerned with distinctions between the pursuit of means and ends, the classification of "goods," and of course with worth or value. Professor Laird considers that "the possibilities of moral arithmetic are a good deal more promising than many moralists would have us suppose." The common-sense of an ideal Utilitarianism, which includes self-realization, as well as altruistic benefit: "much in ethical theory," it is said, "may be justified by an ideal Utilitarianism, but not all."

The general result of this book is an impression of the extremely complex nature of moral questions when brought into direct contact with normal human action. No doctrinaire philosopher could do better than to study the inquisitive way in which the writer examines the practical implications of hastily accepted premisses, and shews how life constantly contradicts the moralist.

There is the impression too that ethics is the study of the whole man integrally in action pursuing ends, and that the divisions of will and emotion are only formal.

A striking side of Professor Laird's work, when compared with, say, Sidgwick or Rashdall, is the concrete way he deals with humour and quip with the most abstract ideas. Ethics is often dry and boring, but here there is a deftness of touch which carries the reader's attention. As a lesson in the detached way of approaching moral problems, it will be most useful for students to read Professor Laird for the schools, and many whose schools are long over will find in it points of view which are on the way of settling problems which seemed insoluble, or imperfectly solved.

It is just worth noting that an authority on Moralia like Laird, although dealing with every *variety* of moral teaching, never once speaks of anything but *Ethics*. It is surely time for us to make a stand against the use of a supposed singular (*Ethic*), for here some quite considerable writers have tripped in designating some special form of moral teaching.

W. J. FERRAR.

THEOLOGIE DER ORDNÜNGEN. By Paul Althaus. Second, enlarged edition. C. Bertelsmann: Gütersloh, 1935. Mk. 2.

The impact of the principles of the National Socialist revolution in Germany makes itself felt in every department of life, not less in the sphere of individual and social ethics than in matters of religious faith and church organization. One result has been an attempt to restate Christian principles, and, on the part of some writers, to relate them to the new political ideas at present being tested in Germany. In the restatement of Christian ethical principles considerable influence has been exerted by Brunner's *Das Gebot und die Ordnüngen*, published a year or two ago, and shortly to appear in a translation in English. Dr. Althaus makes frequent reference to Brunner's book. The ordinances of the moral code are set forth as fundamentally creative ideas and rescripts of God, which determine the behaviour of man as an individual and in society, because he also is the creation of God. The moral law cannot, therefore,

be set aside by man or by the Government under which he lives. It embraces him in all the relationships of life—marriage, nationality (*Volkstum*), law, State and industry—all are, or should be, dominated by the original divine ordinances. Every relationship has been complicated by sin and death. Whereas marriage was an original creative-ordinance, introduced in Paradise, law and the State are sin-ordinances, introduced after the Fall—an idea which is, of course, as old as Augustine. At the same time God remains independent of His ordinances, and we are not to make gods of them.

Race is an ordinance of God, and Germans abroad are bound to maintain their nationality as such. Obedience to God implies adaptation to the process of national history and modern conditions. Church and State are two provinces, and conflict only arises when either invades the terrain of the other. Holy Scripture reveals the ordinances of God for all peoples, for example, in monogamous marriage, but the Decalogue is also a local Jewish code. The German *risorgimento* is not merely a result, but the fulfilment of spiritual conflict. A theology of the ordinances must always end in the direction of the Gospel of forgiveness and redemption through Jesus Christ.

A. J. M.

THEOLOGISCHE AUFSÄTZE—II. By PAUL ALTHAUS. C. Bertelsmann: Gütersloh, 1935. Mk. 5.30 and 6.80.

Dr. Althaus is a Professor of Theology at Erlangen, who, together with other writers, is doing much to restate German theology to meet the needs of modern Germany. Whatever restrictions may have been imposed upon theological periodicals in that country, they do not appear to apply to the publication of specific theological works, partly, no doubt, because recognized theologians write more temperately than theological journalists. This does not mean that the theologians are less critical of certain phases in the modern German *Weltanschauung* than the journalists, but they do pay tribute where tribute is due to those in authority, and so receive favourable treatment when they come to state positively their own theological position.

All this is illustrated by the present publication. It is written from the Lutheran standpoint and deals with the theology (or divinity) of God in the light of Luther's doctrine of justification; justification itself; the world and sin; the intrinsic value of the religion in relation to the Gospel; the Gospel and the Jewish question, religious tolerance and intolerance; the spirit of Lutheran ethics; the conception of guilt and responsibility in German belief; together with three essays on Luther's translation of Psalm xc. 10, on Kahler's contrast between the "historical Jesus" and the "biblical Christ," and on Brunner's book, *Der Mittler*.

Professor Althaus writes approvingly of Luther and Brunner, though with discrimination, especially of the latter. To the late Dr. Kahler he pays a high tribute as one of the creative minds of modern German Lutheran theology. On the Jewish question he reminds us that the problem is not only political and social but theological, and after examining the teaching of several Jewish theologians, he concludes that the question of prophecy and its fulfilment is still vital. The Jew is still faced by the judgment of Jesus, "Ye shall not see me henceforth until ye say: Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Tolerance

can only proceed from a faith which does not surrender truth. There are, therefore, limits to the religious tolerance shewn by the State ; at the same time the State will always be grateful for the intolerance of the Church against Bolshevism and the Godless movement. On the other hand, while the State must shew patience towards the German Faith movement and the so-called new paganism, the Church cannot be content with a mere spiritual conflict, it must be intolerant to these new religions. He criticizes Hauer severely, and says that the question is not "Can a German be a Christian ?" but "Can a German be a heathen ?" Hauer has no right to claim to speak for the whole of Germany. He has no grasp of the Christian idea of sin. Hauer's theology of guilt is of no service to the State.

A. J. M.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER